



Good Practices for University Open-Access Policies (2015)

Citation

Shieber, Stuart, and Peter Suber. 2015. Good Practices For University Open-Access Policies. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Open Access Project. Original and most updated version can be found here: http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Good_practices_for_university_open-access_policies

Published Version

<https://cyber.harvard.edu/hoap/sites/hoap/images/Goodpracticesguide-2015.pdf>

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:31886452>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

Good Practices for University Open-Access Policies


Edited by Stuart Shieber and Peter Suber

*Produced by the Harvard Open Access Project and the
Berkman Center for Internet & Society at Harvard University.*

The wiki for this document, which should be considered the most up-to-date and authoritative version, is available at http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Good_practices_for_university_open-access_policies or bit.ly/goodoa

02	Foreword
03	Preface
06	Drafting a policy
17	Adopting a policy
19	Implementing a policy
28	Filling the repository
53	Talking about policy
57	Revising this guide
58	Other formats for this guide
59	Additional resources
64	Endnotes

C o n t e n t s



We have worked directly for many years with colleagues at many institutions on policies to facilitate open access to faculty research. We began writing this guide in 2011 to codify the kind of advice we found ourselves repeating, make it available to more institutions than we could ever reach directly, and solicit the help of others in making it more comprehensive and useful.

We published the first version in October 2012, and regularly enlarge and improve it. We keep the master version on a wiki in order to make this kind of frequent updating easy for us. However, some users prefer to read or share the guide in other formats. We released the first print and PDF editions in October 2013, and are pleased to release the second print and PDF editions. Like the wiki edition, these print and PDF editions stand under CC-BY licenses.


The wiki version will continue to evolve, but these new editions capture the text as it stood on September 7, 2015.

The guide is a product of the Harvard Open Access Project (HOAP). We're grateful to Arcadia, which funds HOAP, to the Berkman Center for Internet & Society, which administers it, and to the many colleagues who have generously shared their comments and expertise with us. We also thank our fellow principal investigators on HOAP, Robert Darnton, William Fisher, Urs Gasser, Sue Kriegsman, Colin Maclay, Phil Malone, John Palfrey, and Jonathan Zittrain; the past and present Berkman project coordinators for HOAP, Adam Holland, Amanda Page, and Kenny Whitebloom; and the past and present HOAP research assistants, Andrea Bernard, Nicole Contaxis, Cherone Duggan, Emily Kilcer, and Uvania Naidoo. For their help with the production of the new editions we also thank Elizabeth Field, Daniel Dennis Jones, and Marshall Lambert.

For the latest updates, please see the master version at <http://bit.ly/goodoa!>

Stuart Shieber and Peter Suber, October 2015

Foreword



This is a guide to good practices for university open-access (OA) policies. It's based on the type of policy first adopted at Harvard, Stanford, MIT, and the University of Kansas. Policies of this kind have since been adopted at a wide variety of institutions (see p. 63) in North America, Europe, Africa, and Asia, for example, at affluent and indigent institutions, public and private institutions, research universities and liberal arts colleges, and at whole universities, schools within universities, and departments within schools.

At the same time, the guide includes recommendations that should be useful to institutions taking other approaches.

The guide is designed to evolve. No early version will cover every point on which good practices would be desirable or might be discernible. We plan to revise and enlarge it over time, building on our own experience and the experience of colleagues elsewhere. We welcome suggestions.

The guide was in the works for several years before the first public version [launched](#)² in October 2012. It's one small part of the larger effort described in Recommendation 4.2 of [the ten-year anniversary statement of the Budapest Open Access Initiative](#)³ (September 2012): Supporters of open access “should develop guidelines to universities and funding agencies considering OA policies, including recommended policy terms, best practices, and answers to frequently asked questions.”

We deliberately call our recommendations “good practices” rather than “best practices”. On many points, there are multiple, divergent good practices. Good practices can change as circumstances change, and as we learn more. Good practices are easier to identify than best practices. And there can be wider agreement on which practices are good than on which practices are best.

We hope the guide will be useful to institutions considering an OA policy, and to faculty, students, librarians, and administrators who would like their institution to start considering one.

P r e f a c e

The guide is written and edited by [Stuart Shieber](#)⁴ and [Peter Suber](#).⁵ The guide reflects their views as individuals, not necessarily those of Harvard University.

- Stuart is a Professor of Computer Science and the Faculty Director of the Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication. Stuart's ORCID is [0000-0002-7733-8195](#).⁶
- Peter is the Director of the Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication, Director of the Harvard Open Access Project, and Faculty Fellow at the Berkman Center for Internet & Society. Peter's ORCID is [0000-0002-3577-2890](#).⁷
- Emily Kilcer researched and wrote the section on Filling the repository. (See p. 32.) Emily is a Project Coordinator at the Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication and Research Assistant at the Harvard Open Access Project.

We thank the following colleagues and organizations for their support, and hope to add more names to both lists over time. Please [contact us](#)⁸ if you or your organization may be interested. Readers should not assume that consulting experts and endorsing organizations support every recommendation in the guide.

This guide has been written in consultation with these expert colleagues:

- Ginny Barbour, Executive Officer of the Australasian Open Access Support Group (AOASG)
- Isabel Bernal, Manager of institutional repository DIGITAL.CSIC, Spanish National Research Council (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, CSIC)
- Amy Brand, Director of The MIT Press, and Affiliate of the Berkman Center for Internet & Society
- Ellen Finnie Duranceau, Program Manager, Scholarly Publishing and Licensing, MIT Libraries
- Ada Emmett, 2012-2013 Visiting Associate Professor of Library and Information Science and Special Assistant to the Dean for Scholarly Communications, Purdue University; Scholarly Communications Program Head, University of Kansas (KU) Libraries, and Chair of the KU Open Access Task Force
- Heather Joseph, Executive Director of the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC)

- Iryna Kuchma, Open Access Programme Manager of Electronic Information for Libraries (EIFL)
- Alma Swan, Convenor of Enabling Open Scholarship (EOS), Director of the Directory of Open Access Journals, and Director of Key Perspectives Ltd.

The guide is endorsed by these projects and organizations:

- [Association of Research Libraries \(ARL\)](#)⁹
- [Australasian Open Access Support Group \(AOASG\)](#)¹⁰
- [Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions \(COAPI\)](#)¹¹
- [Confederation of Open Access Repositories \(COAR\)](#)¹²
- [Electronic Information for Libraries \(EIFL\)](#)¹³
- [Enabling Open Scholarship \(EOS\)](#)¹⁴
- [Harvard Open Access Project \(HOAP\)](#)¹⁵
- [Mediterranean Open Access network \(MedOANet\)](#)¹⁶
- [Open Access Directory \(OAD\)](#)¹⁷
- [Open Access Policy Alignment Strategies for European Union Research \(PASTEUR4OA\)](#)¹⁸
- [Open Access Scholarly Information Sourcebook \(OASIS\)](#)¹⁹
- [Right to Research Coalition \(R2RC\)](#)²⁰
- [Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition \(SPARC\)](#)²¹
- [SPARC Europe](#)²²
- [UK Open Access Implementation Group \(OAIG\)](#)²³

Drafting a policy

1. What an OA Policy can achieve p. 6
2. Statement of goals of the policy p. 7
3. Types of policy p. 7
4. Grant of rights to the institution p. 9
5. Deposit in the repository p. 10
6. Deposited version p. 10
7. Deposit timing p. 11
8. Waiver option p. 11
9. Embargo option p. 12
10. Scope of coverage, by content category p. 13
11. Scope of coverage, by time p. 14
12. Transferring rights back to the author p. 14
13. Transferring rights to others p. 15
14. Enhancing user rights p. 15
15. Implementation process p. 15
16. Separating the issues p. 16

(1) What an OA policy can achieve

In this guide, we present our understanding of good practices for university open-access policies. An effective OA policy can build support for OA, as an academic and social good, into standard university practice.

As we discuss below, we recommend a policy that provides for automatic default rights retention in scholarly articles and a commitment to provide copies of articles for open distribution. Policies of this sort have many benefits: they allow authors to retain extremely broad use and reuse rights with a minimum of effort; they allow universities to help authors in openly distributing articles for maximum impact; they allow other researchers and the general public to obtain broader access to articles; and they support these benefits without the need to negotiate with publishers and while preserving academic freedom, author choice, and consistency with copyright law.

Although we find this kind of policy preferable, alternative sorts of policies can also be effective, and we discuss them as well. Some kinds of policies we find counterproductive, and we recommend avoiding them.

(2) Statement of goals of the policy

Many policies open with some statement of the policy goals. There is no “best practice” statement of the benefits of OA or the goals of promoting OA. But there are some mistakes to avoid.

- Don't say that the purpose of the policy is “only”, “solely”, or “exclusively” to achieve one benefit of OA, or some particular list of benefits. Leave the door open to achieve all the benefits of OA, even if you are not ready to enumerate them all.
- If you want to permit all the benefits of OA, then a narrow statement of the policy's purpose could give unwanted support to a plaintiff, court, or future administrator at your own institution trying to force a narrow reading on the policy. Even an innocent-seeming phrase like “for the purpose of open dissemination” could be interpreted later to prevent text mining, or to prevent the institution from transferring rights back to the author. (See p. 18.) Finally, any clause limiting the range of non-exclusive rights that authors grant to the university will in turn limit the range of rights that the university could later transfer back to the author.

(3) Types of policy

There are at least six types of university OA policy. Here we organize them by their methods for avoiding copyright troubles.

1. The policy grants the institution certain non-exclusive rights to future research articles published by faculty. This sort of policy typically offers a waiver option or opt-out for authors. It also requires deposit in the repository.
 - We recommend type #1 in this guide. Most of the good practices collected here are about that sort of policy.
2. The policy requires faculty to retain certain non-exclusive rights when they publish future research articles. Whether or not it offers a waiver option for authors, it requires deposit in the repository.
 - We do not recommend #2 because it requires faculty to negotiate with publishers in order to retain the needed rights. That is difficult to do. Many faculty are intimidated by the prospect and will not to do it. Even if all tried it, some will succeed and some will fail. Some will get one set of rights and some will get another. That will make access uneven and multiply implementation headaches.

3. The policy seeks no rights at all, but requires deposit in the repository. If the institution already has permission to make a work OA, then it makes it OA from the moment of deposit. Otherwise the deposit will be “dark” (non-OA) (see p. 26) until the institution can obtain permission to make it OA. During the period of dark deposit, at least the metadata will be OA.

- When type #1 policies are politically unattainable on a certain campus, then we recommend type #3. We prefer #1 to #3 because #1 provides permission to make articles OA through the repository and #3 does not.

4. The policy seeks no rights at all and does not require dark deposits. It requires repository deposit and OA, but only when the author’s publisher permits them.

- We do not recommend #4 because it allows recalcitrant publishers to opt out at will. Some institutions believe that a loophole for recalcitrant publishers is the only way to avoid copyright infringement. But that is mistaken. All six approaches listed here, properly implemented, avoid copyright infringement.
- Similarly, some institutions believe that an opt-out for authors, as in #1, is the same as an opt-out for publishers, as in #4. But that is also mistaken. Publishers have reasons or incentives to opt out far more often than authors.

5. The policy does not require OA in any sense, but merely requests or encourages it.

- When #1 and #3 are both politically unattainable on a certain campus, we recommend either a type #5 policy or waiting until the community is ready for a type #1 or #3 policy.

6. The policy does not require OA in any sense, but asks faculty to “opt in” to a policy under which they are expected to deposit their work in the repository and authorize it to be OA.

- We do not recommend #6 because it is equivalent to no policy at all. Faculty may already opt in to the practice of self-archiving and OA. This sort of policy differs little from #5 except by leaving the impression that asking faculty to opt in to an OA policy is somehow different from requesting or encouraging OA itself.

For independent analyses concluding that type #1 policies are lawful, and provide legally sufficient permission for OA through the institutional repository, at least in the United States, see:

- Simon Frankel and Shannon Nestor, [Opening the Door: How Faculty Authors Can Implement an Open Access Policy at Their Institutions](#),²⁴ a white paper from SPARC and Science Commons, August 2010. The paper shows how OA policies can avoid legal pitfalls, and uses the Harvard and MIT policies as a model.
- Eric Priest, [Copyright and the Harvard Open Access Mandate](#),²⁵ *Northwestern Journal of Technology and Intellectual Property*, preprint August 1, 2012, published version forthcoming. Also see Stuart Shieber’s blog post on Priest’s article, [Is the Harvard open-access policy legally sound?](#)²⁶ *The Occasional Pamphlet*, September 17, 2012.

On our preference for type #1 and type #3 policies over the other four types, see Recommendation 1.1 from the [BOAI-10 statement](#)²⁷ (September 2012): “When publishers will not allow OA on the university’s preferred terms, we recommend either of two courses. The policy may require dark or non-OA deposit in the institutional repository until permission for OA can be obtained. Or the policy may grant the institution a nonexclusive right to make future faculty research articles OA through the institutional repository (with or without the option for faculty to waive this grant of rights for any given publication).”

(4) Grant of rights to the institution

The policy should be worded so that the act of adopting the policy is the same as the act of granting the university certain non-exclusive rights. The policy should not merely ask, encourage, or require faculty to retain certain rights in the future, when they sign publishing agreements. It should say, “Each faculty member grants...”, or “hereby grants...”, not “will grant...” or “must grant....”

By granting the rights at the time of the vote for the policy, in advance of future publications, the policy frees faculty from the need to negotiate with publishers. It secures the rights even when faculty fail to request them. It secures the same rights for every faculty member, not just the rights that a given faculty member might succeed in obtaining from a given negotiation with a given publisher.

Some policies start with the grant of rights that we recommend, but then muddy the waters with confusing or even inconsistent additional language.

- One mistake is to accompany the grant of rights with a provision encouraging faculty to negotiate with publishers to retain some or all of the same rights already granted to the institution. This is confusing because one purpose of the grant of rights is to make that kind of negotiation unnecessary. The two clauses might even be inconsistent, one making negotiation unnecessary for OA, and the other implying that negotiation is necessary. (A negotiation clause would be more justified if it aimed to insure that authors only sign contracts consistent with the policy; for more on this, see our entry on author addenda.) (See p. 24.)
- Another mistake is to accompany the grant of rights with a provision creating a loophole for publishers whose publication agreements, or in-house copyright policies, do not allow OA on the university’s terms. This is confusing because one purpose of the grant of rights is to close exactly that sort of loophole. The two clauses might even be inconsistent, one implying that publishers have no opt-out (except by requiring authors to obtain waivers), (see p. 60) and other implying that publishers may opt out at will.
- Another mistake is to grant rights to “published scholarly articles” rather than to “scholarly articles” more broadly. This language could easily be interpreted to mean that the author grants no rights to the institution until the article is published. By then, of course, many authors will have already signed publishing contracts, and will have far fewer rights to grant to the institution. Often they will not have enough rights to authorize OA through the institutional repository. The same problem could arise if the grant of rights is limited to “peer-reviewed scholarly articles”, because by the time an article is peer-reviewed, many authors will already

have signed copyright transfer agreements with publishers. The key purpose of the rights-granting provision of the policy is to grant a wider rather than a narrower set of non-exclusive rights to the institution, and to do so before the author signs a publishing contract and loses the ability to grant such a wide range of rights. If the institution wishes to limit repository deposits to a certain subset of scholarly articles, such as those that are peer-reviewed and/or published, it can say so elsewhere in the policy or in its implementation plan.

For reasons to grant a wider rather than a narrower range of non-exclusive rights to the institution, see the entry above on stating the goals of the policy. (See p. 11.)

Note that in what follows we'll often refer to the grant of rights as the "license" or "permission" for OA.

For the relationship of this grant of rights to the work-for-hire doctrine, see our entry on academic freedom. (See p. 57.)

(5) Deposit in the repository

The policy should either require deposit of relevant work in the institutional repository, or require making relevant work available to the institution for deposit.

The waiver option should apply only to the grant of rights, not to deposit in the repository. (More under waivers below.) (See p. 15.)

The policy needn't require faculty to make deposits themselves. The deposits may be made by others (such as student workers) on behalf of faculty, provided that faculty make the appropriate versions (see p. 26) of their articles available for deposit. For simplicity in what follows, we will refer to depositors as faculty, but will mean to include others acting on behalf of faculty.

(6) Deposited version

The policy should specify that the deposited version should be the final version of the author's peer-reviewed manuscript, sometimes called the accepted author manuscript (AAM). This version contains the text approved by peer review. It should also include all the charts, graphics, and illustrations which the author has permission to deposit. It should include post-review copy-editing done collaboratively between author and journal. It need not include any post-review copy editing done unilaterally by the journal, the journal's pagination, or the journal's look and feel.

If the publisher consents, then the institution should deposit the published version of an article to complement the final version of the author's peer-reviewed manuscript already on deposit.

- This could be mentioned in the policy itself or simply made an implementation practice.
- The published version should only replace the author's manuscript when the published version allows at least as many reuse rights as the author's manuscript. Some publishers will be happy to make this substitution in order to prevent the circulation of multiple versions. However, when the published version carries a more restrictive license than the author's manuscript, then the

published version should be deposited alongside the accepted author manuscript, and the latter should not be removed from the repository.

- SHERPA RoMEO keeps a [list of publishers](#)²⁸ willing to allow deposit of the published version.

(7) Deposit timing

The policy should require faculty to deposit their peer-reviewed manuscripts at the time of acceptance for publication, or no later than the date of publication.

If the policy allows authors to specify an embargo (see p. 16) on a given article, the deposit should still be made between the time of acceptance and the time of publication. But it will be a dark deposit (see p. 22) until the embargo period expires.

(8) Waiver Option

The policy should make clear that the institution will always grant waivers (or opt-outs), no questions asked. Faculty needn't offer a justification or meet a burden of proof. To prevent fear or confusion on this point, the policy should refer to "obtaining" a waiver, or "directing" that a waiver be granted, rather than "requesting" a waiver.

To allay potential faculty concerns that an institution may override a waiver in the future, the waiver should contain language that it may not be revoked by the institution.

Waivers (or opt-outs) should apply only to the license or grant of rights to the institution, not to the deposit in the repository. Faculty should deposit their articles in the repository even when they obtain waivers. At least initially, these would be dark or non-OA deposits. (See p. 22.)

- Hence, if the policy has two large provisions, one granting a certain license to the institution and the other calling for certain deposits in the repository, then the waiver provision should talk about waiving the license, not waiving the policy.

For one way to fulfill the previous recommendations, see the language used in the [Harvard letter](#)²⁹ granting a waiver:

- "Pursuant to the Open Access Policy adopted by [school within Harvard] on [date], this communication serves to notify you that your request for a waiver of the...Open Access license for [article title] in [journal name] has been granted....This waiver may not be revoked by Harvard, and Harvard will have no license under the policy unless you choose to relinquish the waiver...."

Faculty who want waivers for separate publications should obtain separate waivers. Institutions should not offer "standing waivers" that apply to all future publications from a given faculty member. Standing waivers would defeat the purpose of shifting the default to permission for OA.

A waiver for a particular article means that the institution does not receive the policy's usual bundle of non-exclusive rights for that article. Hence, for that article the university will not have permission from the policy to provide OA. But the university may have permission from another source, such as the author (who may have retained rights from the publisher) or the publisher (who may give standing permission for repository-based OA after a certain embargo period).

- For example, if the publisher allows repository-based OA six months after publication, then the university will eventually have permission from the publisher even if it doesn't have permission from the policy. If the university has a copy of the article on dark deposit in the repository, then it may make the repository copy OA as soon as the embargo runs or the new permission takes effect.
- Hence, the waiver provision of the policy should not promise that the university will never make a copy OA. On the contrary, the policy might say that the university will make faculty work OA whenever it has permission to do so.

Some supporters of OA worry that a waiver option will make the policy ineffective. They worry that the waiver rate will be high, for example, above 50%. However, the experience at every school with a waiver option is that the waiver rate is low. At both Harvard and MIT it's below 5%.

- Omitting a waiver option would limit faculty freedom to submit new work to the journals or publishers of their choice. Including a waiver option restores that freedom but without impeding OA. The kind of policy we recommend shifts the default to OA. It uses faculty inertia to support OA rather than to support standard copyright transfers which give the OA decision to publishers. Faculty who worry that a waiver option entails a high waiver rate should not underestimate the power of shifting the default. It can and does change behavior on a large scale.

In this guide we use the terms “waiver” and “opt-out” interchangeably.

Also see the entry on waivers in the section on Talking about a policy. (See p. 60.)

(9) Embargo option

The policy may also give authors the right to specify an embargo period (a delay in the open distribution of an article).

The [Duke policy](#)³⁰ is a model here: “The Provost or Provost’s designate will waive application of the license for a particular article or delay access for a specified period of time upon written request by a Faculty member.”

- Harvard’s Model [Open Access Policy](#)³¹ incorporates the Duke language with this annotation: “Duke University pioneered the incorporation of an author-directed embargo period for particular articles as a way of adhering to publisher wishes without requiring a full waiver. This allows the full range of rights to be taken advantage of after the embargo period ends, rather than having to fall back on what the publisher may happen to allow. Since this is still an opt-out option, it does not materially weaken the policy. An explicit mention of embargoes in this way may appeal to faculty members as an acknowledgement of the prevalence of embargoes in journals they are familiar with.”

When faculty specify an embargo period, they should still deposit their articles in the repository on the usual timetable. (See p. 15.) The embargo option allows a delay in making a deposited article OA, not a delay in the initial deposit.

For schools and authors, embargoes are much better than waivers.

- When the author obtains a waiver, neither the school nor the author may exercise the large bundle of non-exclusive rights granted by the policy. When the author obtains an embargo and not a waiver, both the school and the author may exercise those rights, with the temporary exception that they may not provide OA for the length of the embargo. Needless to say, the best situation is when authors obtain neither a waiver nor an embargo.
- If you wonder why avoiding waivers is better for authors, and not just for institutions, see our entry on transferring rights back to the author. (See p. 18.) Under the kind of policy we recommend, institutions with non-exclusive rights granted by the policy may grant them back to the authors, giving authors far more rights to reuse their own work than they would have had without this type of policy. Authors who want to maximize their rights to reuse their own work should be the first to try to avoid obtaining a waiver.
- In our experience, many authors and publishers who want waivers really want embargoes, or would be satisfied with embargoes. Hence, when possible, see whether those seeking waivers would accept embargoes instead.

We recommend against any policy language, or implementation practice, requiring the university to respect a given embargo period for all articles from a given journal or publisher, at least without a significant concession from the journal or publisher in exchange. For more details, see the entry on treaties with publishers. (See p. 29.)

(10) Scope of coverage, by content category

The policy should specify what categories of content are covered by the license and the expectation of deposit. In particular, the policy should cover scholarly articles, or the kinds of writings typically published in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and conference proceedings.

The policy should not cover scholarly writings that generate royalties (textbooks, monographs) or writings not considered scholarly in the field (op-ed pieces, popular articles). In our experience, widening the policy to require deposit of royalty-producing work or non-scholarly work will increase faculty resistance and decrease the odds that faculty will adopt it.

The [Harvard model policy](#)³² covers “scholarly articles” alone, and explains in this annotation:

- What constitutes a scholarly article is purposefully left vague. Clearly falling within the scope of the term are (using terms from the [Budapest Open Access Initiative](#))³³ articles that describe the fruits of scholars’ research and that they give to the world for the sake of inquiry and knowledge without expectation of payment. Such articles are typically presented in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and conference proceedings. Clearly falling outside of the scope are a wide variety of

other scholarly writings such as books and commissioned articles, as well as popular writings, fiction and poetry, and pedagogical materials (lecture notes, lecture videos, case studies).

- Often, faculty express concern that the term is not (and cannot be) precisely defined. The concern is typically about whether one or another particular case falls within the scope of the term or not. However, the exact delineation of every case is neither possible nor necessary. In particular, if the concern is that a particular article inappropriately falls within the purview of the policy, a waiver can always be obtained.
- One tempting clarification is to refer to scholarly articles more specifically as “articles published in peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings” or some such specification. Doing so may have an especially pernicious unintended consequence: With such a definition, a “scholarly article” doesn’t become covered by the policy until it is published, by which time a publication agreement covering its disposition is likely to already have been signed. Thus the entire benefit of the policy’s nonexclusive license preceding a later transfer of rights may be vitiated. If clarifying language along these lines is required, simultaneously weaker and more accurate language can be used, for instance, this language from Harvard’s explanatory material (also used above): “Using terms from the Budapest Open Access Initiative, faculty’s scholarly articles are articles that describe the fruits of their research and that they give to the world for the sake of inquiry and knowledge without expectation of payment. Such articles are typically presented in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and conference proceedings.”

Works not covered by the policy can still be placed in the repository, and with permission can still be made OA. In fact we recommend that the repository accept, welcome, and encourage deposits that are not required by the policy (see p. 29) or covered by the policy license.

(11) Scope of coverage, by time

Neither the grant of rights nor the deposit requirement should be retroactive. Under the kind of policy we recommend here, faculty can only make the desired grant rights to the institution for future, still-unpublished works, not for previously published works.

However, the policy or separate implementation documents might encourage deposit of works completed prior to the adoption of the policy.

(12) Transferring rights back to the author

The kind of policy we recommend here not only grants rights to the institution, but also allows the institution to grant those rights to others. Here’s the key language (from the [Harvard model policy](#)):³⁴ “More specifically, each Faculty member grants to [university name] a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles...and to authorize others to do the same” (emphasis added).

The primary purpose of this language is to allow the institution to grant rights back to the author. The effect is that authors retain or regain certain rights to their work, including rights that they might have transferred away in their publishing contracts.

- This gives authors far more rights to reuse their own work than (1) they have under standard publishing contracts or (2) they have under other types of OA policy.
- This not only helps access, use, and reuse. It promotes author freedom. Hence, when well-explained, it also helps muster faculty support for the policy in the first place.

For this reason, the set of rights transferred to the institution should be as broad as possible. That enables the author to retain or regain the broadest possible set of rights.

Although the kind of policy we recommend here can correctly be called a rights-retention policy, it doesn't provide direct or simple rights retention by authors. Instead it provides direct rights retention by institutions, and indirect rights retention by authors.

(13) Transferring rights to others

Authors subject to this kind of policy may still sign publishing contracts with publishers. The policy grants certain non-exclusive rights to the institution, and authors should not sign contracts giving the same rights to publishers (or other parties). However, they will never need to do so. The vast majority of publishers agree that they can obtain the rights they need for publication without requiring authors to obtain waivers. But when authors wish to publish with a publisher who thinks otherwise, they may obtain a waiver, no questions asked.

For detail on alerting publishers to the rights already granted to the institution, see the entry on author addenda. (See p. 24.) For detail on waiving the grant of rights to the institution for a given work, see the entry on waivers. (See p. 60.)

(14) Enhancing user rights

Authors subject to this kind policy may use open licenses, such as [Creative Commons licenses](#),³⁵ to enhance user rights. The kind of policy we recommend here is compatible with the use of open licenses but does not require them. Institutions may adopt this kind of policy and decide afterwards when or whether to make use of open licenses. Similarly, it may adopt this kind of policy and leave authors free to make these decisions on their own, case by case.

Harvard does not routinely put open licenses on individual deposits. Instead, the [terms of use](#)³⁶ for its repository function as an open license for all deposits.

(15) Implementation process

The policy should include a provision making a certain office or committee responsible for implementing the policy.

A policy is more likely to pass if it only says what it has to say. Other details can be left to the office charged with implementing the policy.

When it's desirable to share both the draft policy language and the implementation plan, make sure to keep the two distinct. That way the policy itself is not enlarged to include the implementation plan,

and can remain brief and minimal. In addition, it gives the implementation group the flexibility to adjust its plan, within the guidelines of the policy, to suit changing circumstances.

(16) Separating the issues

A university requiring green OA (deposit in OA repositories) may also encourage gold OA (publishing in OA journals). But it should be careful about doing both in the same document. Where it has been tried, faculty tend to assume that the policy requires gold OA, or publishing in OA journals, and thereby limits their freedom to submit new work to the journals of their choice.

- Part of the background here is that many people still mistakenly believe that all OA is gold OA, and therefore that a policy trying to assure OA must be trying to assure gold OA or to require publishing in OA journals.
- This is such a serious problem that if the policy document mentions gold OA at all (using any terminology, such as “OA journals”, “OA publishers”, or “OA publishing”), then it should only be to make clear that the university is not considering a gold policy, and that the policy will preserve faculty freedom to publish wherever they wish.

A university with a green OA policy may (and we think, should) also [launch a fund](#)³⁷ to help faculty pay publication fees at fee-based OA journals. But the green OA policy should make clear that it is separate from the journal fund. Otherwise faculty may think that the policy itself requires faculty to submit new work to OA journals, a common and harmful misunderstanding.

We offer some other recommendations on separating the issues in the section on adopting a policy. (See p. 21.)

Adopting a policy

1. Adopting authority p. 17

2. Educating faculty about the policy before the vote p. 17

3. Other tips for the adoption process p. 18

(1) Adopting authority

The policy should be adopted by the faculty, not the administration.

- The reason is simply that the kind of policy we recommend includes a grant of non-exclusive rights from faculty to the institution, and this grant of rights should be grounded in faculty consent.
- However, even when the faculty consent is manifest in a vote, there are good reasons (at least in the US) to get a [written affirmation](#)³⁸ of the policy after the vote.

Campus entrepreneurs leading the campaign for a policy should be faculty. If the idea and initial momentum came from librarians or administrators, they should find faculty members willing to lead the effort.

Because the policy will apply to faculty more than others, it should be a faculty initiative and should be perceived to be a faculty initiative. Otherwise, many faculty will suspect or object that they are being coerced. The question should be what faculty want for themselves.

(2) Educating faculty about the policy before the vote

Make clear that the policy requires deposit in an OA repository, not submission to an OA journal. (It's about green OA, not gold OA.) It does not limit faculty freedom to submit work to the journals of their choice.

Make clear that the waiver option guarantees that faculty are free to decide for or against OA for each of their publications. The policy merely shifts the default from non-deposit and non-OA to deposit and OA.

Make clear that "softening" the policy to "opt-in" is pointless. All institutions without opt-out policies already have opt-in policies. Faculty at schools without policies may always opt in to the practice of making their work (green or gold) OA.

Make clear that the waiver option also gives publishers the right to require a waiver as a condition of publication. Hence, publishers who decide that publishing authors bound by an OA policy is too risky, or that the costs exceed the benefits, may protect themselves at will simply by requiring waivers. Moreover, they may protect themselves without refusing to publish faculty bound by OA policies. Hence, faculty who worry about the policy's effect on certain favorite publishers, such as society publishers, needn't paternalize those publishers by voting down a proposed policy. Instead they should understand that the policy already gives those publishers the means to protect themselves, if they feel the need to do so. (By the way, very few feel the need to do so; the number is in the low single digits at Harvard and MIT.)

- Faculty who want to take an extra step to protect certain publishers should explain to them how the waiver option enables them to protect themselves. Some publishers may not already understand that. In our experience, publishers who object to university OA policies either assume that all such policies are unwaivable, or do not take the waiver option into account.

Also see the recommendations on separating the issues (see p. 20) and talking about a policy. (See p. 57.)

Here are some FAQs used to explain policies to faculty:

- University of California, San Francisco, [before adoption FAQ](#)³⁹ and [after adoption FAQ](#)⁴⁰
- [Columbia University](#)⁴¹
- [Duke University](#)⁴²
- [Harvard University](#)⁴³
- [MIT](#)⁴⁴
- [Stanford University School of Education](#)⁴⁵

(3) Other tips for the adoption process

Toward the end of the drafting process, and during the whole of the campus education process, the drafting committee should host a series of face-to-face meetings to answer questions and objections. Don't rush the vote. Keep holding these meetings until faculty stop coming.

Where it would help (and only where it would help), point out how a draft policy uses language successfully adopted and implemented elsewhere. Some faculty are not aware of the number of successful policies elsewhere. Some may think the institution is sailing in uncharted waters. Some may strengthen their original OA motivation with the desire to cooperate or compete with certain peer institutions.

Implementing a policy

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Launching a repository p. 19 | 9. Associating articles with their definitive versions p. 24 |
| 2. Individualized writing p. 19 | 10. Repository indexing p. 24 |
| 3. Facilitating waivers p. 20 | 11. Repository withdrawals p. 25 |
| 4. Author addenda p. 20 | 12. Content beyond the policy p. 25 |
| 5. Multiple deposits p. 21 | 13. Treaties with publishers p. 25 |
| 6. Dark deposits p. 22 | 14. Learning the denominator p. 26 |
| 7. Deposited versions p. 22 | 15. Working with publishers p. 26 |
| 8. Internal use of deposited versions p. 22 | 16. Tracking usage stories p. 27 |

(1) Launching a repository

The institution must have an institutional repository, or participate in a consortial repository. Most schools launch a repository before adopting a policy to fill it, but some do it the other way around.

(2) Individualized writing

Institutions implementing the kind of policy recommended here will want their policy to prevail over a later publishing contract inconsistent with the policy. Merely passing the policy may attain that goal. However, to be more certain, practically and legally, that the policy license survives any later transfer, US institutions should get authors to sign a “written instrument” affirming the policy.

- Here’s why: Under US copyright law ([17 USC 205\(e\)](#))⁴⁶ a “nonexclusive license...prevails over a conflicting transfer of copyright ownership if the license is evidenced by a written instrument signed by the owner of the rights licensed or such owner’s duly authorized agent.”
- This provision doesn’t say that in the absence of a written instrument, the nonexclusive license will not prevail over a later contract inconsistent with the policy. A university might take the position that the nonexclusive license in the policy will prevail in any case, and will probably never have to test its position in court. But to be safe, it’s best to get a written affirmation of the grant of rights (or license) as specified by 17 USC 205(e).
- We don’t know how to accomplish this goal outside the US, and welcome advice from people who do know.

In our experience, many US institutions that want to adopt the kind of policy recommended here share the draft policy language with their university counsel, but do not share their plan to obtain a written affirmation of the policy. Hence, it’s no surprise that the university counsel often objects that the policy does not suffice to secure the rights needed, and will be superseded by any publishing contract demanding exclusive rights. There’s no doubt under 17 USC 205(e) that a written affirmation of the policy solves this problem. But if you are seeking support from lawyers (university counsel, law faculty, or other lawyers in the faculty, library, or administration), make sure they understand this part of the implementation plan.

Harvard uses several methods to get the written affirmation of the policy. When faculty deposit their own articles, a dialog box in the deposit process asks them to affirm the grant of rights (the license) in the policy. When someone else (an administrative assistant or the Office for Scholarly Communication) deposits articles on their behalf, the faculty member must first have signed a one-time assistance authorization form containing an affirmation of the grant of rights. Thus, whatever route an article takes into the repository, the institution obtains a written affirmation of the license.

- Here's Harvard's language for affirming the license: "[I]f I am a member of a Harvard Faculty or School that has adopted an open access policy found at <http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/>,⁴⁷ this confirms my grant to Harvard of a non-exclusive license with respect to my scholarly articles as set forth in that policy."
- In addition, all new faculty are asked to sign a [participation agreement](#),⁴⁸ essentially promising to live up to the university's copyright and patent policies. The Harvard agreement now includes this provision: "If I am a Faculty member of a Faculty or School of the University that has adopted an Open Access Policy, I hereby confirm my grant to Harvard of a non-exclusive license with respect to my scholarly articles, as set forth in that policy."
- Finally, these written affirmations of the policy document the consent of faculty hired after the adoption of the policy.

(3) Facilitating waivers

The institution should create a web form through which faculty can obtain waivers. This not only streamlines bookkeeping, but proves to faculty that the process is easy and automatic. Harvard can share code for such a web form.

Some publishers may require faculty to obtain a waiver as a condition of publication. Institutions need not try to prevent this. Accommodating these publisher policies proves that publishers have the means to protect themselves, if they choose to use them, and that fact makes it unnecessary for faculty to protect or "paternalize" their favorite publishers (e.g. society publishers) by voting against a proposed policy. On the other hand, the institution may want to talk with publishers (see p. 29) who take this position, to see whether they can work out an accommodation.

(4) Author addenda

An [author addendum](#)⁴⁹ is one way for authors to retain rights that a standard publishing contract would otherwise give to the publisher. For policies of the kind we recommend, author addenda are unnecessary for rights retention, for the same reason that individual author-publisher negotiations are unnecessary. The institution has the rights needed for OA directly from the grant of rights in the policy. (See p. 13.) Hence, faculty need not obtain those rights from publishers.

However, author addenda may be desirable for other reasons.

- An addendum alerts the publisher that the author's institution already possesses certain non-exclusive rights. This can prevent misunderstandings on each side.
- An addendum goes further by proposing to modify the contract to make it consistent with the university's OA policy. The publisher may accept or reject an addendum. But when accepted, the addendum actually modifies the publishing contract. Without this modification, and without a waiver, some authors could sign contracts inconsistent with the policy.
- See the section on individualized writing (see p. 23) above for the reasons why a well-implemented institutional OA policy would take priority over a later publishing contract inconsistent with the policy. Because the policy takes priority, authors who sign publishing contracts inconsistent with the policy may be unable to live up to those contracts. Because the policy takes priority and retains key rights, (see p. 13) the risk is not copyright infringement but breach of contract. An addendum modifying the contract completely eliminates the risk of breach.
- Note that there may be no legal risk to eliminate.
 - Under some legal theories, a widely-known prior license would protect the author from a claim of breach of contract, even in the absence of an addendum. This is one more reason to publicize the university's OA policy.
 - In addition, some but not all unmodified contracts are already consistent with the kind of policy recommended here.

Also see the entry below on working with publishers. (See p. 30.)

(5) Multiple deposits

If a faculty member deposits a paper in a non-institutional repository (e.g. arXiv, PubMed Central, SSRN), the institutional repository should harvest a copy.

To avoid diluting the traffic numbers at the several repositories, all should comply with the (evolving) [PIRUS⁵⁰](#) and [PIRUS2⁵¹](#) standards for sharing traffic data.

If a given article is subject to two OA policies (e.g. one from the university and one from the funder), the university should either offer to make the deposit required by the funder or should harvest back the copy deposited with the funder.

- For example, most faculty at Harvard Medical School are subject to the NIH policy. If they deposit in the Harvard repository, then Harvard will insure that a copy is deposited in PubMed Central. If they deposit in PubMed Central, then Harvard will harvest back a copy for the institutional repository.
- The author should not have to deposit the same article more than once. If faculty think that an institutional policy would double their administrative burden, many will vote against it.

(6) Dark deposits

Faculty should always deposit suitable versions (see p. 14) of new scholarly articles in the institutional repository. If they obtain a waiver for a given article, then the deposit will at least initially be “dark” (or non-OA). But the author should still deposit the manuscript.

- One reason for repositories to allow dark deposits is to support the message that faculty should always deposit their new work.

If a deposit is dark, at least the metadata should be OA.

- Another reason to allow dark deposits is to facilitate search indexing and discovery for work which, for one reason or another, cannot yet be made OA.

If a deposit is only intended to be dark temporarily, for a known embargo period, then dark deposits should be set to open up automatically at the future date determined by the author decision or embargo period. Most repository software today supports this option.

If an author deposited a manuscript and obtained a waiver, then the institution does not have permission under the policy to make that manuscript OA. At least initially, that deposit must be dark. However, the repository may switch the manuscript to OA if it can obtain permission from another source, such as a standing policy of the publisher’s to allow OA after a certain embargo period. See the entry on waiver options (see p. 15). Repositories should make dark deposits OA whenever they are legally allowed to do so.

For seven reasons why repositories should allow dark deposits, see Stuart Shieber, [The importance of dark deposit](#),⁵² The Occasional Pamphlet, March 12, 2011.

(7) Deposited versions

Some authors will deposit the published version of an article instead of the final version of the author’s peer-reviewed manuscript. (See p. 14.)

- Some will mistakenly believe it is the version the policy asks them to deposit. Some will simply prefer it and demand to make it the OA version.
- Unless the [publisher consents to the open distribution of the published version](#),⁵³ ask the author for the final version of the author’s peer-reviewed manuscript. If the author can’t find the right version or insists on depositing the published edition, then make it a dark deposit (see p. 26) and open it up if and when the repository can obtain permission to make it OA.

(8) Internal use of deposited versions

When the institution reviews faculty publications for promotion, tenure, awards, funding, or raises, it should limit its review of research articles to those on deposit in the institutional repository. Or it should use the institutional repository as the mechanism for submitting articles for use or review by internal committees.

Versions of this policy have been adopted at the Université de Liège, Edinburgh Napier University, the University of Oregon Department of Romance Languages, the Catholic University of Louvain, China's National Science Library, the Chinese Academy of Sciences, India's International Center for Tropical Agriculture, Canada's Institute for Research in Construction, the University of Salford, and the University of Luxembourg. This type of policy is under consideration at the Université d'Angers.

This type of policy has been recommended in many major reports and analyses of best practices for university policies (here listed in chronological order):

- The May 2010 [Alhambra Declaration on Open Access](#)⁵⁴ recommended that universities should “consider repository-deposited material for evaluation processes and research assessment.”
- The September 2012 [tenth-anniversary statement from the Budapest Open Access Initiative](#)⁵⁵ recommended (1.6) that “Universities with institutional repositories should require deposit in the repository for all research articles to be considered for promotion, tenure, or other forms of internal assessment and review....[This policy should not] be construed to limit the review of other sorts of evidence, or to alter the standards of review.”
- A September 2013 [report](#)⁵⁶ from the [UK House of Commons Select Committee on Business, Innovation and Skills](#)⁵⁷ acknowledged (paragraph 26) that “authors are much more likely to archive their research papers in their institutional repositories if they are required to do so as a condition of funding compliance and if deposit is linked to institutional performance evaluation, research grant applications and research assessment.”
- A November 2013 [report](#)⁵⁸ from the [Mediterranean Open Access Network](#)⁵⁹ (MedOANet) concluded (p. 12) that an OA “requirement should be linked to professional advancement and evaluation. Authoritative researcher, departmental and institutional publication lists should be directly drawn from the institutional repository for evaluation purposes, thus making clear to authors that this is the source that will be used for this purpose and that they therefore have a personal interest in making sure their work is fully represented in the repository.”

When properly written and implemented, these policies would not alter the kinds of evidence that committees are willing to consider, and would not alter the standards they use in awarding promotion, tenure, or funding.

Institutions not ready to change their process for promotion and tenure could [change the form](#)⁶⁰ by which faculty apply for promotion and tenure and list their publications. The new form could simply add fields for the URLs of OA editions of the faculty member's research articles.

Another approach, taken by Harvard's [School of Engineering and Applied Sciences](#)⁶¹ (SEAS) in [October 2014](#),⁶² is to recommend that candidates coming up for promotion and tenure prepare for their review by depositing their scholarly articles in the institutional repository.

An analogous policy has been recommended for national research-assessment policies:

- In a April 2003 [article](#),⁶³ Stevan Harnard argued that UK funding agencies “should mandate that in order to be eligible for Research Assessment and funding, all UK research-active university staff must maintain (I) a standardised online RAE-CV, including all designated RAE performance indicators, chief among them being (II) the full text of every refereed research paper, publicly self-archived in the university’s online Eprint Archive and linked to the CV for online harvesting, scientometric analysis and assessment.”
- A February 2013 [report](#)⁶⁴ from the [Higher Education Funding Council for England](#)⁶⁶ recommended (Sections 11 and 12) that works not deposited in an OA repository immediately upon publication should not be eligible for the new Research Excellence Framework (REF), the UK’s national research-assessment program. HEFCE [adopted this policy](#)⁶⁶ in March 2014.

(9) Associating articles with their definitive versions

The author manuscript deposited in the repository is typically not identical to the definitive published version, and its provenance should be made clear. This can and should be done in at least two ways.

First, each deposited manuscript or article should include the full citation to the published edition. This may be done in a free-text citation metadata field using any suitable citation style, or the equivalent information may be put in a set of metadata fields providing the date, journal name, volume, number, pages, etc.

Second, when the published article is online, then the repository should link to it. This can be done in more than one way. For example, the Harvard repository links to definitive versions...

1. on search results pages associated with each search result,
2. on item metadata pages, and
3. on a cover page added to the front of the deposited PDF of the article.

(10) Repository indexing

The repository should be configured to support crawling by search engines.

- See for example the [JISC InfoNet recommendations](#)⁶⁷ and [Google Webmaster Guidelines](#).⁶⁸

Repository managers should check to see whether the contents are discoverable through major search engines, and follow up any indexing failures.

This is not just a technical detail. Faculty who vote for an OA policy want to know that the resulting works will be discoverable through ordinary search engines. If faculty believe that deposit in the repository only benefits the rare user who makes a special visit to the repository and runs a local search, then many would vote against the policy or not bother to deposit their work.

(11) Repository withdrawals

If a publisher sends a reasonable takedown request to the repository, the repository should always comply.

If the author wishes to withdraw an article already on deposit (e.g. because it is mistaken, embarrassing, superseded by a newer version, etc.), then the repository should withdraw the article.

The author can always obtain a waiver, and then the university would no longer have the rights to distribute it under the policy. That's one reason why repositories should follow author wishes on distribution. Another is that repositories depend on faculty cooperation and good will. In any case, experience suggests that authors rarely ask to withdraw their own articles.

(12) Content beyond the policy

The institution should welcome the deposit of types of scholarly content above and beyond the types covered by the policy. For example, if the policy focuses on scholarly articles, the repository should welcome deposit of other genres as well, such as theses and dissertations, books or book chapters, datasets, and digitized work from other media. If the policy covers articles published after a certain date, it should welcome the deposit of articles published before that date.

Even if the policy only covers work by faculty, the repository should welcome deposits from scholars at the institution who are not faculty, such as students, research fellows, post-docs, staff, and administrators.

Even if the policy only gives the institution permission to make certain kinds of content OA, the repository could accept dark deposits where it doesn't have permission for OA. In those cases it could at least provide OA to the metadata.

(13) Treaties with publishers

Some publishers may concur with the policy if the university clarifies that the policy will be implemented in certain ways. Providing such clarifications may be entirely reasonable, given that the policy language itself can't possibly cover all aspects of its implementation. For example, publishers may want to be sure that for manuscripts published in their journals the repository entry will include a complete citation and link to the published edition, (see p. 28) or that the university will not distribute the publisher's version of the article, (see p. 28) or that the license will not be used to sell articles. If the institution is comfortable with these clarifications (perhaps because they describe practices to which the university is already committed), it may make these explicit in return for an explicit statement of the publisher's cooperation with the policy, for instance, by not requiring waivers or addenda to publication agreements. These agreements may contain any provisions consistent with the policy and agreeable to both sides. (Harvard calls these agreements "treaties")

We strongly recommend against treaties requiring universities to respect a given embargo period for all articles from a given journal or publisher. Such a treaty would essentially give the journal

or publisher a blanket opt-out of a significant provision of the university OA policy, and violate the express interest of the faculty in adopting a policy to shift the default to immediate OA.

- However, when authors rather than publishers seek an embargo, and seek it case by case rather than for all articles from a certain journal or publisher, the policy can accommodate them. See the entry on embargo options. (See p. 16.)

Here's an [example of treaty language](#)⁶⁹ used at Harvard.

(14) Learning the denominator

An institution can easily tell how many articles are on deposit in its repository. But it cannot easily tell how many articles ought to be on deposit. If it wants to calculate the deposit rate (the number deposited divided by the number that ought to be deposited), then it must determine the denominator. This is a critical piece of information in measuring the effectiveness of the policy and its implementation.

Some institutions ask faculty to submit an annual list of their publications. If so, the information should be shared with the repository managers. The raw list of publications is less helpful than one broken down by categories, such as books, journal articles, and so on. If the policy only covers journal articles (for example), then the relevant denominator is the number of journal articles.

(15) Working with publishers

See the entry on author addenda. (See p. 24.) A well-written author addendum can explain to publishers what rights the author has already granted to the institution. Hence it can prevent authors from signing publishing contracts they cannot fulfill and prevent misunderstandings on all sides. However there are other ways to achieve some of the same goals.

Publishers who normally require the transfer of exclusive rights, but who do not demand waivers from authors at your institution, can modify their publishing contracts to facilitate cooperation with the institution. For example, it would help both sides if publishers included a sentence [like this one from the Science Commons addendum](#):⁷⁰ “Where applicable, Publisher acknowledges that Author’s assignment of copyright or Author’s grant of exclusive rights in the Publication Agreement is subject to Author’s prior grant of a non-exclusive copyright license to Author’s employing institution and/or to a funding entity that financially supported the research reflected in the Article as part of an agreement between Author or Author’s employing institution and such funding entity, such as an agency of the United States government.”

- Such a clause would make addenda unnecessary for authors and publishers, and cost the publisher nothing.

(16) Tracking usage stories

MIT pioneered a technique for tracking stories about how users are using articles from its repository. Harvard and perhaps others have copied the technique as well. The technique is to add an extra page to the front of the repository copy an article. (Some repositories already add such a page to provide citation and licensing information.) The new page requests optional information about the users, why they need the article or how they plan to use it, and any thoughts they want to share on how open access helps them. The page links to a web form for willing users to fill out. The MIT language is:

- The MIT Faculty has made this article openly available. [Please share](#)⁷¹ how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

The stories can then be compiled and shared. For example, see the stories from [MIT](#)⁷² and [Harvard](#).⁷³

- Or see the [video](#)⁷⁴ of snippets from some user testimonials sent to the Harvard repository. (This video was created for Open Access Week 2014.)

Filling the repository

1. **Advocacy and education p. 29**
2. **Automated deposit tools p. 35**
3. **Copyright support p. 38**
4. **Customization and value-added tools p. 40**
5. **Ease of use p. 41**
6. **Embedding p. 43**
7. **Funding allocation p. 44**
8. **Internal use p. 45**
9. **Metrics p. 45**
10. **Personalization p. 48**
11. **Proxy deposit or harvesting p. 49**

Adopting an OA policy is easier than implementing one, and the hardest part of implementing a “green” or repository-based policy is to insure the deposit of all the work that ought to be deposited. This section covers incentives for authors to deposit their work themselves, as well as other methods, human and machine, for getting their work into the repository. It could be considered a subsection within the section on Implementing a policy. (See p. 23.) But because it’s large and still growing, we’re making it a section to itself.

(1) Advocacy and education

An institution can reach out to its community to educate researchers on the benefits of OA, the benefits of deposit in the repository, and the mechanics of the deposit process. The idea is to explain the policy, generate interest, alleviate concerns, answer objections, and remove impediments to deposit. Examples follow:

- The [University of the Arts London](#)⁷⁵ has focused advocacy efforts on delivering personalized outreach to faculty with “floor walking”: meeting with faculty to walk through a deposit and solicit feedback on the process and answer questions. This outreach has led to technical improvements and developed critical personal relationships. [Goldsmiths, University of London](#)⁷⁶ developed outreach material and then used this material as the foundation for outreach presentations. Both institutions indicated that to be effective in arts advocacy it is critical to understand the department’s culture and establish a relationship with faculty. See details of both programs [here](#).⁷⁷
- A case study of the [University of Strathclyde’s](#)⁷⁸ IR notes that the university offers “training sessions and information about how to publish the documents in the repository”. See details [here](#).⁷⁹ note this is a toll-access article.
- The JISC-funded [Repositories Support Project](#)⁸⁰ provides some answers to “Common issues raised in advocacy” [here](#)⁸¹ as mentioned in a [Confederation of Open Access Repositories \(COAR\)](#)⁸² report; see details [here](#).⁸³
- The [University of Nairobi](#)⁸⁴ Library has partnered with the Medical Students Association of Kenya “to reach students, faculty and University Management Board, populate the institutional repository and introduce an open access mandate.” See details [here](#)⁸⁵ and [here](#).⁸⁶
- The [Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology](#)⁸⁷ has been raising community awareness about the University’s IR through workshops, one-on-one visits with faculty, online and print promotion, and peer training. See details [here](#).⁸⁸
- [Stellenbosch University](#)⁸⁹ is [auditing](#)⁹⁰ [SUNScholar](#)⁹¹ to ensure that it is reliable and authoritative. Included in the audit is a scan of the IR’s “Generally Accepted Repository Practice,” which details the promotion efforts for the IR, including a [help guide](#),⁹² social media outreach efforts, and more. See details [here](#).⁹³
- The [Queensland University of Technology](#)⁹⁴ (QUT) suggests working with influential faculty to gain “early adopters” of the institutional repository, for example, “late-career academics” and “high-status researchers,” who could then serve as advocates for deposit. QUT also recommends partnering with department and school administrators by offering on-site training and providing details on participation and download rates by department/school; see details [here](#).⁹⁵

- [Columbia University's](#)⁹⁶ efforts to encourage faculty participation in the repository begin with robust outreach, which includes going to new student orientations, attending department meetings, and offering workshops. Rebecca Kennison notes that being visible and tailoring the message to the audience is critical; listen to details [here](#).⁹⁷
- [Massey University](#)⁹⁸ offers an “Introduction to eResearcher” presentation to faculty, which includes a description of what eResearcher is and how it works; details may be found [here](#).⁹⁹
- In 2006 the [University of Southern Queensland](#)¹⁰⁰ developed a marketing plan for their repository, which included actions aimed at specific audiences to “[i]ncrease awareness and knowledge” of the repository and open access efforts to “increase confidence of academic and general staff in submission processes”; see details of the plan [here](#).¹⁰¹
- Findings from a case study of the [University of Illinois](#),¹⁰² [University of Massachusetts](#),¹⁰³ [University of Michigan](#),¹⁰⁴ [University of Minnesota](#),¹⁰⁵ and [Ohio State University](#)¹⁰⁶ indicated that “convincing key faculty to contribute” to the institution’s repository is a fruitful “means of bringing others along”. See details [here](#).¹⁰⁷
- A survey of content recruitment strategies found that 5 of 7 institutions studied used “promotional activities,” including workshops, presentations, informational brochures, and websites to inform their constituents about the “submission procedure” and “benefits that are involved when making your thesis available online”. The seven institutions surveyed were [Boston College](#),¹⁰⁸ [University of Hong Kong](#),¹⁰⁹ [Stellenbosch University](#),¹¹⁰ [University of Helsinki](#),¹¹¹ [North Carolina State University](#),¹¹² [University of Manitoba](#),¹¹³ and [Brigham Young University](#).¹¹⁴ See details [here](#).¹¹⁵
- The [Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas](#)¹¹⁶ (CSIC) launched an advocacy campaign for OA Week 2012 that shares researcher stories about why they deposit their work into the IR. See details [here](#).¹¹⁷ CSIC also publishes a newsletter that shares internal strategies for filling the repository. See details [here](#),¹¹⁸ but note the newsletter is only available in Spanish. Last, CSIC strengthened the institution’s “training and awareness” program, details of which may be found [here](#).¹¹⁹
- JISC provides a [Research Information Management infoKit](#)¹²⁰ and [Digital Repository infoKit](#),¹²¹ the latter of which provides “a practical ‘how to’ guide to setting up and running digital repositories.” A section within the “Management Framework” discussion reviews methods for institutional change, which offers practical tips on [advocacy](#),¹²² [culture change](#),¹²³ crafting a [core message](#),¹²⁴ [advocacy options](#),¹²⁵ and [advocacy activities](#).¹²⁶ Some of these methods are illustrated with examples of activities taken by particular institutions. See details [here](#).¹²⁷
- A [University College London](#)¹²⁸ study explores policies on, practices surrounding, and “barriers to the electronic deposit of e-theses” in the United Kingdom. Several of the identified concerns could be alleviated with education. See details [here](#).¹²⁹
- The [Queensland University of Technology](#)¹³⁰ (QUT) uses targeted outreach efforts, including workshops with discipline-specific messages, and library liaisons participate heavily in the education and outreach process. See details [here](#).¹³¹

- A detailed [report](#)¹³² from the [Confederation of Open Access Repositories \(COAR\)](#)¹³³ on “sustainable, replicable best practices related to populating repositories” discusses advocacy efforts at the [Digital Repository Federation \(DRF\)](#)¹³⁴ in Japan, including building relationships, “always [being] visible,” and creating a tailored message (find the full DRF report [here](#)).¹³⁵ The COAR report also covers efforts at the [Universität Konstanz](#)¹³⁶ which rely heavily on building personal connections to recruit content and develop allegiances (find the full Konstanz report [here](#)).¹³⁷
- Four [case study sketches](#)¹³⁸ explore the advocacy efforts of the [University of Zimbabwe](#),¹³⁹ [Kamuzu College of Nursing](#),¹⁴⁰ the [University of Latvia](#),¹⁴¹ and the [University of Khartoum](#).¹⁴² See details [here](#).¹⁴³
- The [University of Exeter's](#)¹⁴⁴ detailed advocacy plan aims to reach to encourage use of RePosit. Methods are tailored to the different audiences, and social media is used “as much as possible” because it is quick, easy, and has a wide reach. See details [here](#).¹⁴⁵
- The [University of Minho](#)¹⁴⁶ has established a four-tiered program to increase “the levels of adoption of the repository,” which includes a promotional plan of activities, such as, “evangelis[ing] within our faculty...by means of presentations, papers, interviews, news in the press, promotional materials, flyers, websites.” See details [here](#).¹⁴⁷
- The [Kultivate](#)¹⁴⁸ project works “to increase the rate of arts research deposit.” As such, it has developed a [toolkit](#)¹⁴⁹ to support repository managers and staff in the development of an advocacy plan to encourage deposit of visual arts researchers “in both a visual and textual way”. See details [here](#).¹⁵⁰
- Central to the [University of Central Lancashire's](#)¹⁵¹ IR's launch was the partnership that was established with the research community at the outset to not only gather content for the repository, but “[embed] the Repository within the University strategic goals and operational workflows at a high level to ensure its sustainability through ongoing population by research, teaching and learning and other project output”. The outreach for this partnership started early in the process and included continual representation of and engagement with the research community. See details [here](#).¹⁵²
- [ETH](#),¹⁵³ [MIT](#),¹⁵⁴ and the [University of Rochester](#)¹⁵⁵ use outreach strategies such as “branding the programme and raising awareness of the issue(s)...making the IR attractive to potential depositors...reinforcing a positive attitude and encouraging conditions that make depositing work in an IR an attractive option...[and] seeking to establish two-way communication and the involvement of the target audience.” See details [here](#).¹⁵⁶
- Following a library survey conducted at [University of Jyväskylä](#),¹⁵⁷ which revealed that participating faculty had several common misconceptions about the deposit process, permissions, and the repository's function, the library aims to clarify the deposit process and the role of researchers therein. See details [here](#).¹⁵⁸

- The [Centre for Research Communications, University of Nottingham's](#)¹⁶⁹ Bill Hubbard discusses author concerns about depositing their work in institutional repositories. Foremost is that peer-reviewed work is listed alongside grey literature, but there are also concerns about “infringing copyright and infringing embargo periods;...the paper not having been ‘properly edited by the publisher’; not knowing of a suitable repository; a concern about plagiarism or unknown reuse; then not knowing how to deposit material in a repository and not knowing what a repository was.” In response, Hubbard notes that education and “continued, repetitive, hard slog advocacy of the basics” will ease these concerns. See details [here](#).¹⁶⁰
- A [University of Cambridge](#)¹⁶¹ and [University of Highlands and Islands](#)¹⁶² project aimed to increase deposits to, satisfaction in, and “institutionalisation” of the institutional repository with “a technical integration tool which connected the Virtual Research Environment (VRE) to the IR.” Communication and relationship building are described as “vital” to the program’s success, because “the focus had to remain on the institutionalisation of the IR.” See details [here](#).¹⁶³
- The [University of Southampton](#)¹⁶⁴ offers IR advocacy in many forms; the library “provide[s] training and guidance, including bespoke and one-to-one training, not just on the use of the repository but on topics such as OA in general, e-theses, bibliometrics, data management and current awareness.” See details [here](#).¹⁶⁵
- Cameroon’s [University of Buea](#)¹⁶⁶ used a “start small...to ensure functionality and effectiveness” plan to gather content from the faculty: the IR was first populated with “postgraduate theses.” Currently advocacy efforts are underway to ensure the larger university community supports deposits to the IR. See details [here](#).¹⁶⁷
- Following the initial implementation of the repository Ktisis,¹⁶⁸ the [Cyprus University of Technology's](#)¹⁶⁹ library staff focused on its promotion, which included the “develop[ment of] information services...using help pages, user guides, flyers, etc.” to address copyright concerns of researchers and help them “understand the benefits that the institutional repository can offer.” See details [here](#).¹⁷⁰
- A study at [Oregon State University](#)¹⁷¹ surveyed Thomson Reuters’ Journal Citation Reports and SHERPA RoMEO to determine whether “core journals in a discipline...allow[ed] pre- or post-print archiving in their copyright transfer agreements.” With this list, library staff approached faculty with “scholarly communication issues such as author’s rights and open access” as a means of opening the discussion to encourage deposit to the institutional repository. See details [here](#).¹⁷²
- [De Montfort University Leicester](#)¹⁷³ (DMU) “aimed to enhance and embed the DMU repository DORA within institutional processes and systems.” Advocacy work, as a component of the EXPLORER project, involved a “targeted approach” that ran for the duration of the project, from events to blog posts and “advocacy materials,” as well as demonstrations. See details [here](#).¹⁷⁴
- The [University of Glasgow's](#)¹⁷⁵ created a [Daedalus](#)¹⁷⁶ project board that included faculty members, recruited OA-supportive faculty to submit early content, and offered presentations and other events to introduce the project to the community. See details [here](#).¹⁷⁷

- The [University of Rochester](#)¹⁷⁸ created “a ‘crib sheet’ for librarians of responses to faculty questions and concerns about the IR”. Other examples of IR promotional methods are detailed [here](#).¹⁷⁹
- The [University of Illinois](#),¹⁸⁰ [University of Massachusetts](#),¹⁸¹ [University of Michigan](#),¹⁸² [University of Minnesota](#),¹⁸³ and [Ohio State University](#)¹⁸⁴ have varied “successful strategies” of securing content, one of which includes “convincing key faculty to contribute as a means of bringing along others.” See details [here](#).¹⁸⁵
- [Rollins College](#)¹⁸⁶ library involved faculty in periodical reviews when canceling titles as a practical means of opening discussion on campus about scholarly communication; OA journals and repositories were then introduced as an alternative to the subscription model. The different stakeholders received different advocacy messages; for example, “the provost was interested in institutional reputation, the Dean of Faculty by the idea of a stable repository of faculty publications, IT and the librarians in a hosted solution...which did not involve much staff time and expertise [and]...the faculty...in more visibility for their own research and a policy that was flexible.” See details [here](#).¹⁸⁷
- The [University of Glasgow](#)¹⁸⁸ is working to embed their repository “into the fabric of the institution” over time. Included in these efforts are “Open Access advocacy activities” and “[r]unning training courses for departmental staff and administrators about Open Access, [the] Policy and Repository.” See details [here](#).¹⁸⁹
- [Kalamazoo College's](#)¹⁹⁰ institutional repository development has involved many constituents; these populations - library and IT staff, deans, faculty, and administrative assistants - require outreach for success, including fostering “a sense of community ownership” and “buy in.” See details [here](#).¹⁹¹
- A case study of three libraries and their approaches to filling their institutional repositories with content shows that all three institutions employed advocacy for the institutional repository to acquire content, from faculty outreach with library liaisons to instructional presentations and branding and marketing of the repository. See details [here](#).¹⁹²
- The [University of Northampton](#)¹⁹³ is working to “modify university procedures for submission to NECTAR, increase researcher involvement, encourage the deposit of full content and further embed NECTAR in researcher workflows”; included in the university's plan to do so is to “provide a programme of appropriate training, advocacy and promotional activity.” Several “presentations” and “training sessions” have been delivered. See details [here](#).¹⁹⁴
- At the [California Institute of Technology](#)¹⁹⁵ encouraging deposit is a “sociological and strategic” endeavor. To be successful in recruiting researcher support, it has been important to work toward securing senior faculty as early adopters, who “may view the proposition [of deposit] as a capstone/culmination/collected works project for their career.” By supporting this argument with data, a convincing position may be made that “content in the IR is highly visible and read.” These identified “opinion leaders” can become fruitful partners in the deposit of work to the institutional repository. See details [here](#).¹⁹⁶

- Outreach for the institutional repository at the [University of Southampton](#)¹⁹⁷ is strong, ranging from providing presentations and one-on-one support, to offering “Help and Information,” and “engag[ing] people on all levels involved in the depositing process.” See details [here](#).¹⁹⁸
- An institutional repository liaison was hired at [Minho University](#)¹⁹⁹ to provide author support, which included outreach efforts such as introductory and “refresher” presentations, promotional materials, a help desk, and more. See details [here](#).²⁰⁰
- The [University of St Andrews](#)²⁰¹ repository development has included strategies that have been used successfully to encourage deposit. Simply put, “Actual staff on the ground devoting substantial time to interaction with researchers is crucial.” In addition to added services that are headed by librarians, “[p]romotion of the repository can raise awareness amongst our academics of the issues around copyright and full text dissemination, and influence attitudes towards open access.” See details [here](#).²⁰²
- Work from the [California Polytechnic State University](#)²⁰³ offer “[b]asic marketing principles and how to apply them to marketing an institutional repository within a higher education setting.” See details [here](#).²⁰⁴ Note: This is a toll-access work.
- The [Instituto Politécnico de Castelo Branco](#)’s²⁰⁵ institutional repository has implemented a “diffusion strategy,” including conferences and newsletters, which is used to educate the community about the presence of the repository. See details [here](#).²⁰⁶
- [Georgia State University](#)²⁰⁷ has been working “to increase awareness about OA in general and provide practical information to GSU faculty about their ‘copy rights.’” New faculty were targeted with an outreach campaign that included “Peter Suber’s new book Open Access from MIT Press...a bookmark explaining OA; information on the university’s institutional repository, the [Digital Archive @ GSU](#).²⁰⁸ and contact information for a subject specialist librarian in the faculty member’s field.” The marketing campaign also included “academic deans and other key administrators on campus” and has positively received. See details [here](#).²⁰⁹
- [Open University](#)²¹⁰ identifies advocacy and development as the cornerstones for building an institutional repository collection without a mandate. The advocacy methods have been varied, from using social media for promotional efforts to attending department meetings. The efforts have attracted “63% of the OU’s journal output published in 2008 and 2009” and the repository managers are “getting around 36 full-text deposits per week, compared to a low of 2 per week before the advocacy/development campaign.” See details [here](#).²¹¹
- The [University of Stellenbosch](#)²¹² offers several suggestions for “internal” and “external” marketing efforts to garner support for an institution’s repository. Included as examples are “presentations,” “demonstrations,” and “individual appointments” for marketing the repository and generating interest in deposit. See details [here](#).²¹³
- An Open Access Week [poster](#)²¹⁴ from the [London School of Economics and Political Science](#)²¹⁵ clearly illustrates the value added from depositing in the [LSE Research Online](#)²¹⁶ institutional repository in several bullet points: high visibility, professional profiles with accurate and comprehensive content, and copyright compliance. These benefits serve as a counterpoint to

common author practices for posting their work on “personal webpages.” This simple advocacy tool highlights major talking points.

- The [University of Glasgow](#)²¹⁷ reports on the University's efforts “to create an Open Access Repositories Resource Pack (OARRPack) for the UK's Open Access Implementation Group (OAIG),” the end goal of which is “a mix of the high level information necessary to enact institution-wide policy changes and the practical details needed in order to implement these policy changes.” OAIG's²¹⁸ research pack provides “[Information and guidance](#),”²¹⁹ which includes a section on [advocacy and cultural change](#).²²⁰ There are links to “[Key resources](#),”²²¹ tips for crafting “a clear message about why an institution's repository is important, and why people need to engage with it,” and sample institutions that have led successful advocacy campaigns: the [University of Liège](#),²²² [University of Southampton](#),²²³ and [Queensland University of Technology](#).²²⁴ Find a [video](#)²²⁵ by William Nixon, of the University of Glasgow, on the resource pack. See details [here](#).²²⁶
- The [Welsh Repository Network](#)²²⁷ offers several solutions to common challenges for repository deposits. Education is highlighted as important for generating buy-in to the institutional repository across many fronts: from gaining high-level support, which will create an “integration with other [university] systems and processes” and can lay the foundation for an institution-wide mandate, to building an understanding across the community of users of the benefits of depositing their work into the repository (e.g., a wider readership, public funding issues, author rights and copyright, etc.). See details [here](#).²²⁸
- Joanne Yeomans, of the [CERN Library](#)²²⁹ staff introduces new staff to the deposit process and uses an internal bulletin to remind staff to deposit work. Future plans include following up with authors about specific works that have not yet been deposited. See details [here](#).²³⁰
- [Furman University](#)²³¹ librarians developed a year-long “expert speaker” program aimed at educating faculty about “open access, altmetrics, author's rights, and other relevant topics.” Processes are detailed for soliciting speakers and organizing such programming on campus. See details [here](#).²³²
- [Miami University](#)²³³ library partnered with the Center for the Enhancement of Learning, Teaching, and University Assessment to implement a year-long outreach program that pulled faculty, students, and staff together to learn about “open access, journal economics, predatory publishing, alternative metrics (altmetrics), open data, open peer review, etc.” The program was developed with a focus on community development, discussion, and group participation. See details [here](#).²³⁴

(2) Automated deposit tools

Institutions can use automated deposit tools to increase the ease of participation in repository deposit. These tools help to streamline, automate, or standardize the deposit process to encourage participation. Examples follow.

1. [BibApp](#)²³⁵ “matches researchers on your campus with their publication data and mines that data to see collaborations and to find experts in research areas.” Find the press release announcing BibApp [here](#).²³⁶ Instances of BibApp may be found at the [University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign](#),²³⁷ [Marine Biological Library Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution Library](#),²³⁸ and [University of Kansas Medical Center](#).²³⁹
 - [Hannover Medical School](#)²⁴⁰ uses tools such as BibApp, which “showcases the scholarly work done by a particular researcher, research group, department or institution” to motivate researchers to self-deposit. See details [here](#).²⁴¹
 - In a 2009 survey of [OpenDOAR](#)²⁴²-registered institutional repositories that studied copyright clearance activities, BibApp is noted as a tool that can be used to “formaliz[e] permissions workflows.” That BibApp “automatically checks citations for deposit policy in SHERPA/RoMEO” reduces the individual effort of authors and library staff in copyright clearance associated with deposit. See details [here](#).²⁴³
2. [DepositMO](#)²⁴⁴ “seeks to embed a culture of repository deposit into the everyday work of researchers. The project extended the capabilities of repositories to exploit the familiar desktop and authoring environments of its users, specifically, to deposit content directly from Microsoft Word and Windows Explorer.” See details [here](#)²⁴⁵ and [here](#).²⁴⁶
 - DepositMO was introduced at a “JISC Programme meeting” as a way to upload images to streamline the deposit process. See details [here](#).²⁴⁷
3. [DepositMOre](#)²⁴⁸ is “working with selected repository partners to build and apply new discovery and deposit tools and to show statistically MOre deposits in these repositories,” resulting from use of DepositMO tools.
4. [Deposit Strand](#)²⁴⁹ aims “make it easier to deposit into repositories. The projects will identify and implement good practice and technical solutions that can be shared with other institutions, ultimately leading to better populated open access repositories with increased benefit to the researcher, the sector and the economy.” See additional details of the deposit tools [here](#).²⁵⁰
5. [Direct User Repository Access \(DURA\)](#)²⁵¹ aims to “embed institutional deposit into the academic workflow of the researcher at almost no cost to the researcher.” The proprietary “[upcoming Mendeley module](#)”²⁵² that resulted from the JISC-funded project’s efforts works with [Symplectic’s Elements](#)²⁵³ software to allow researchers to “synchronise their personal Mendeley profiles with their Elements account at their institution; and most importantly, take advantage of the rich file sharing capabilities of Mendeley.” See details [here](#).²⁵⁴
6. [EasyDeposit](#)²⁵⁵ is an “open source [SWORD](#)²⁵⁶ client creation toolkit. With EasyDeposit you can create customised SWORD deposit web interfaces from within your browser. You can choose the steps which the user is presented with, change their order, [and] edit the look and feel of the site so that it matches your institution.”

- As a follow-on to the 2009 development of EasyDeposit, multiple-repository-deposit functionality has been added to this script. See details [here](#).²⁵⁷
 - [EasyDeposit](#)²⁵⁸ was born out of a need to have “a generic SWORD deposit interface toolkit that allowed new deposit systems to be easily created.” Two examples from the [University of Auckland Library](#)²⁵⁹ illustrate how Easy Deposit helps to make deposits easier for projects/constituents with specific, singular needs: Ph.D. candidates’ thesis deposit and the archiving of a technical report series. See details [here](#).²⁶⁰
7. [Open Archives Initiative’s Protocol for Metadata Harvesting \(OAI-PMH\)](#)²⁶¹ “provides an application-independent interoperability framework based on metadata harvesting.” For details on the history and foundations of institutional repositories and the importance of standards to repository interoperability to enable the “harvesting, searching, depositing, authentication, and describing [of] contents,” see [here](#).²⁶²
 8. [Open Access Repository Junction \(OA-RJ\)](#)²⁶³ is “an API that supports redirect and deposit of research outputs into multiple repositories.”
 9. [Open Depot](#)²⁶⁴ “ensure[s] that all academics worldwide can share in the benefits of making their research output Open Access. For those whose universities and organisations have an online repository, OpenDepot.org makes them easy to find. For those without a local repository, including unaffiliated researchers, the OpenDepot is a place of deposit, available for others to harvest.”
 10. [Organisation and Repository Identification \(ORI\)](#)²⁶⁵ is “a standalone middleware tool for identifying academic organisations and associated repositories. This project will improve the ORI functionality developed for the Open Access Repository Junction (OA-RJ) and OpenDepot.org by EDINA and establish it as an independent middleware component made openly available for any third party application to use.” See details [here](#).²⁶⁶
 11. [PUMA](#)²⁶⁷ aims to integrate deposit into an author’s workflow as follows: “the upload of a publication results automatically in an update of both the personal and institutional homepage, the creation of an entry in [BibSonomy](#),²⁶⁸ an entry in the academic reporting system of the university, and its publication in the institutional repository.” See details [here](#).²⁶⁹
 12. [RePosit](#)²⁷⁰ “seeks to increase uptake of a web-based repository deposit tool embedded in a researcher-facing publications management system.” The project’s [blog](#)²⁷¹ details the work of the group members, “[University of Leeds](#)²⁷² (Chair), [Keele University](#),²⁷³ [Queen Mary University of London](#),²⁷⁴ [University of Exeter](#)²⁷⁵ and [University of Plymouth](#),²⁷⁶ with [Symplectic Ltd.](#)²⁷⁷” See details [here](#).²⁷⁸
 13. [Repository Junction \(RJ\) Broker](#)²⁷⁹ is “a standalone middleware tool for handling the deposit of research articles from a provider to multiple repositories.” A June 2013 [project update](#)²⁸⁰ notes that RJ Broker’s trial with [Nature Publishing Group](#)²⁸¹ and [Europe PubMed Central](#)²⁸² is complete (and was successful), and the development and transition to RJ Broker as a service is underway. Additionally, MIT is “working on a data importer for DSpace.” See details [here](#).²⁸³

14. [Simple Web-service Offering Repository Deposit \(SWORD\)](#)²⁸⁴ “is a lightweight protocol for depositing content from one location to another.” Find an introductory video on SWORD 2.0 [here](#).

- [BioMed Central](#)²⁸⁵ briefly describes its partnership with [MIT](#)²⁸⁶ “to set up an automatic feed of MIT articles...The SWORD protocol allows the institutional repository to receive newly published articles from any of BioMed Central’s 200+ journals as soon as they are published, without the need for any effort on the part of the author and streamlining the deposit process for the repository administrator.” See details [here](#).²⁸⁷
- SWORD is identified in a [Confederation of Open Access Repositories \(COAR\)](#)²⁸⁸ report on “replicable best practices related to populating repositories” as a “deposit mechanism [that] offers a unified ingestion service and guarantees a robust transfer of manuscripts.” Included in this discussion are [PEER](#)²⁸⁹-created [guidelines](#)²⁹⁰ on “deposit, assisted deposit and self archiving” facilitated by SWORD. See details [here](#).²⁹¹
- The SWORD protocol is used to push the works from BioMed Central to [MIT’s](#)²⁹² repository; this efficiency “make[s] it easier for our faculty to make their work openly available.” See details [here](#).²⁹³
- The SWORD protocol is flexible, enabling deposit to repositories from publishers, the researcher’s desktop, and more. These “different use cases, how they fit into the scholarly lifecycle, and how SWORD facilitates them” are illustrated with examples. See details [here](#).²⁹⁴
- SWORD has application in [arXiv](#)²⁹⁵ deposits, including “ingest from various sources” and “deposit to [Data Conservancy](#).”²⁹⁶ Because arXiv was an “early adopter” of SWORD, it has “> 5000 accepted submissions” from the protocol. See details [here](#).²⁹⁷
- The [University of Auckland](#)²⁹⁸ uses SWORDv2 and a simplified user interface to deposit dissertations the University’s IR. This process means students don’t need to have a user profile or a deep understanding of the repository. The [University of Oxford](#)²⁹⁹ uses SWORDv2 in their data repository, [DataFlow](#).³⁰⁰ which allows for asynchronous record creation. See details of both projects [here](#).³⁰¹

(3) Copyright support

An institution can provide copyright support to depositing authors, which may include services such as publisher negotiation, copyright education, and version control.

- The Alliance for German Science Organizations has negotiated licensing terms that allow several German research centers to “to deposit published articles into repositories, within the context of their content licenses.” A [Confederation of Open Access Repositories \(COAR\)](#)³⁰² report details this and other similar efforts by the Swedish BIBSAM Consortium and Finnish FinELib Consortium. See details [here](#).³⁰³
- A [Confederation of Open Access Repositories \(COAR\)](#)³⁰⁴ report on “sustainable, replicable best practices related to populating repositories” discusses the copyright clearance efforts of five institutions, including [Griffith University](#).³⁰⁵ to make deposit easier for authors. These activities range from advising authors to contacting publishers to secure clearance. See details [here](#).³⁰⁶

- [The University of Minho](#)³⁰⁷ created “value-added services for both authors and readers,” which included “help pages and user guides...to aid authors with the decision of whether or not they could publish their materials in Open Access IRs without infringing any previous copyright releases they may have already signed.” See details [here](#).³⁰⁸
- Results of a survey conducted at the [Cyprus University of Technology](#)³⁰⁹ revealed that forthcoming efforts should be made by the library to “[d]evelop [an] author addendum policy.” See details [here](#).³¹⁰
- Copyright remains a particular concern for artists, and the [Visual Arts Data Service \(VADS\)](#)³¹¹ has “produced [guidelines and scenarios](#)³¹²...to ‘allay fears, misconceptions and ignorance in respect of copyright and IPR’” with the aim to increase deposit through copyright education and support. See details [here](#).³¹³
- The [University of Southampton’s](#)³¹⁴ initiatives that aim to encourage deposit include the library providing “guidance on copyright” to researchers. See details [here](#).³¹⁵
- A [London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine \(LSHTM\)](#)³¹⁶ [Research Online](#)³¹⁷ blog post indicates that “our team who are experienced in navigating open access publisher policies...will check all rights on your behalf and advise you as to what we can make freely available.” See details [here](#).³¹⁸
- The [University of Glasgow](#)³¹⁹ provides copyright support for authors by exploring permissions agreements and contacting publishers with licensing questions directly. See details [here](#).³²⁰
- [Cornell University](#) is an institution that offers researcher assistance in “checking copyright permissions, negotiating with publishers, [and] requesting final manuscript versions from faculty.” See details [here](#).³²¹
- The [University of Illinois](#),³²² [University of Massachusetts](#),³²³ [University of Michigan](#),³²⁴ [University of Minnesota](#),³²⁵ and [Ohio State University](#)³²⁶ have varied “successful strategies” of securing content for deposit, one of which included “negotiating with publishers to include faculty content.” See details [here](#).³²⁷
- The [University of Glasgow’s](#)³²⁸ efforts to embed their repository “into the fabric of the institution” over time included the library’s role in “[c]larifying and assisting researchers with © status of their publications [and] liaising with publishers.” See details [here](#).³²⁹
- The [Oregon State University](#)³³⁰ Library has partnered with the “OSU Advancement News and Communication” office to ensure that the works profiled by the News and Communication group have been deposited in the repository; a wider readership for the faculty member is thus secured and “the appropriate research article [is] deposited.” See details [here](#).³³¹

(4) Customization and value-added tools

An institution can create tools or offer services as add-ons to repository software that offer value to the depositing researcher. Examples follow:

- [MIT](#)³³² collects use stories from people who have downloaded articles from DSpace. See details [here](#).³³³
- [Peter Lu](#),³³⁴ a research associate at [Harvard University](#),³³⁵ has called for repository functionality that automatically generates a researcher's bibliography as a value-added service.
- [Boise State University](#)³³⁶ manages its "Author Recognition bibliography" in the IR: "Not only is faculty scholarship included in the comprehensive university bibliography, it is also showcased as part of their department's collection and on their SelectedWorks site. If a faculty member's work is part of the repository, then it is a part of the bibliography and included in all the related promotional activities." This has increased downloads and "raise the profile of the repository among faculty members." See details [here](#)³³⁷ and [here](#).³³⁸
- [Stellenbosch University](#)³³⁹ is [auditing](#)³⁴⁰ [SUNScholar](#)³⁴¹ to ensure that it is reliable and authoritative. Included in the audit is a scan of the IR's "Generally Accepted Repository Practice", which details the "[c]ustomisation of the repository is usually required to make it fit for the purpose it was created", including "[collections](#),"³⁴² "[submissions](#),"³⁴³ and "[search](#)."³⁴⁴ See details [here](#).³⁴⁵
- The [Queensland University of Technology](#)³⁴⁶ offers a "researcher page," which publicizes an individual's research output in a customizable format. QUT also suggests that researchers "embed the URL into their email signature"; see details [here](#).³⁴⁷
- An active researcher at [Hannover Medical School](#),³⁴⁸ Martin Fenner, created a list of motivators for self-deposit, which includes institutional repositories hosting "primary research data" and integrating the repository content with journal submission. An example of such a tool that Fenner mentions is [eSciDoc](#),³⁴⁹ which "include[s] storing, manipulating, enriching, disseminating, and publishing not only of the final results of the research process, but of all intermediate steps as well." See details [here](#).³⁵⁰
- The [University of Minho's](#)³⁵¹ institutional repository "has been actively involved in the development of add-ons" for DSpace to improve its functionality. Examples of these add-ons are those that enable the sharing of statistics, "request[ing] a copy," a controlled vocabulary, commenting, and recommending. See details [here](#).³⁵²
- In a case study of three anonymous libraries and their approaches to filling their institutional repositories with content, one of the institutions employs a "software specialist who leads repository design customizations and functionality enhancements," which are tailored to meet "the needs and interests of faculty." See details [here](#).³⁵³
- The [Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas's \(CSIC's\)](#)³⁵⁴ efforts to populate its institutional repository include a near-term goal to create APIs that will enable publication lists from the institutional repository to be repackaged "as annual-report-building-applications, author or departmental web pages or standardised CV formats". See details [here](#).³⁵⁵ Additional

“improvements in the platform” are discussed in the CSIC’s [annual report](#).³⁵⁶ including embargo functionality, bibliographic export capability, and social bookmarking features.

- The [University of Liege’s](#)³⁵⁷ repository has been successful from efforts that “demonstrate to our authors that the system has actually been designed for their own benefit.” For example, the repository “provides a single point of entry, but multiple output options, thereby allowing them to generate CVs and publication lists etc.; and it provides a tool to evaluate the quality of their research; and an efficient personal marketing tool.” See details [here](#).³⁵⁸
- Six institutional repositories were studied (including the [University of Minho](#),³⁵⁹ [University of Southampton](#),³⁶⁰ and [CERN](#)³⁶¹) to discover their methods to encourage author deposit. Several “services” are noted that add value for users in all six case studies; for example, automated publication lists, data storage, and RSS feeds were offered, depending on the needs of the local environment. A [table](#)³⁶² illustrates the numerous value-added services that are provided. See details [here](#).³⁶³
- [Cornell’s](#)³⁶⁴ [VIVO](#)³⁶⁵ and the [University of Oxford’s](#)³⁶⁶ [BRILL](#)³⁶⁷ projects are noted examples of institutions with IRs that are “integrating them [repositories] into a much wider context of diverse information systems.” See details [here](#).³⁶⁸
- The [University of Southampton](#),³⁶⁹ [University of Stirling](#),³⁷⁰ and the [University of Minho](#)³⁷¹ all provide “‘Request-a-copy’...‘Email Eprint Request’...‘Fair Dealing’...[or] ‘Fair Use’ Button[s].” EPrints and DSpace both have this functionality developed, which allows works that are either under embargo or restricted from OA distribution by publisher demand to still be deposited and shared in a limited fashion, so that “Researchers from all disciplines can be confident that the couple of clicks required to give a fellow researcher access to their Closed Access article is legal... and fair.” See details [here](#).³⁷²
- The [Open University](#)³⁷³ identifies development as one of the cornerstones for building an institutional repository collection without a mandate. The development methods were varied, ranging from creating “gatekeeper controlled groups” to offering embedded feeds. See details [here](#).³⁷⁴
- [Carnegie Mellon University](#)³⁷⁵ conducted a study of their researchers, who indicated that providing added value from deposit in the repository was critical. Researchers would value “a service or benefit they earnestly want but don’t currently have”. Examples of such efforts that were raised in focus groups include the following: integrated systems, so that updates to personal/lab websites would update the repository; citation generators for end-of-year reporting; data and media deposit, along with supplemental materials; etc. See details [here](#).³⁷⁶

(5) Ease of use

An institution can create systems or put workflows in place to make the deposit process easier for the author. Examples follow:

- [Todd Rogers](#)³⁷⁷ of Harvard’s Kennedy School has suggested various methods to help encourage faculty deposits. He has recommended providing faculty with a sticker of the URL

for the IR's deposit interface, which faculty could stick on their computer as an immediate reminder to deposit work when they submit work for publication. Rogers has also suggested partnering with a school's media office to either collect faculty publications when the media office is alerted to a new publication, or work with the faculty to alert the media office of their publications, if this is a school requirement.

- A case study of the [University of Strathclyde's](#)³⁷⁸ IR notes that the university has a robust help section, "simple and advanced search," and accessibility support, as well as a "[q]uality policy" and suggestion box. See details [here](#).³⁷⁹ note this is a toll-access article.
- The [University of Iowa's Iowa Research Online](#)³⁸⁰ uses metadata crosswalks to "[repurpose] nonMARC metadata from ProQuest" to create new records in the repository, reducing redundancy of effort. See details [here](#).³⁸¹
- A [presentation](#)³⁸² by [Georgia State University's](#)³⁸³ Tammy Sugarman details how catalogers "provide quality control...select keywords...[and] create new metadata and input materials into the IR on a submitter's behalf," which benefits both the depositor and the end user. See details [here](#).³⁸⁴
- The [Queensland University of Technology](#)³⁸⁵ suggests several options for "remov[ing] disincentives" for deposit; for example, converting native format files, reducing the number of mandatory fields, and checking publishers' deposit policies. See details [here](#).³⁸⁶
- [Columbia University](#)³⁸⁷ encourages ease of participation in the repository by creating a one-time sign-off for proxy deposit. Once the researcher has signed this agreement, library staff check for new content from that author; listen to details [here](#).³⁸⁸
- The [Glasgow School of Art's](#)³⁸⁹ repository, [RADAR](#),³⁹⁰ was integrated with the university's website and now has an updated user interface. This new "system [is] based on usability, design, aesthetics and user needs" and has "Improved support for non-text deposits." See details [here](#).³⁹¹
- The [University for the Creative Arts](#)³⁹² has developed a [toolkit](#)³⁹³ that "describes processes and workflows" surrounding the preparation for and deposit of works to the university's institutional repository. The files have been made available for reuse by other institutions. See details [here](#).³⁹⁴
- The [Royal College of Art](#)³⁹⁵ has worked closely with a group of researchers to understand their workflow and needs to ensure that the "easy upload and curation of multiple documents and objects into repository records" was supported. A guide is in development for "collecting data, preparing files, clearing content for publication, [and the] deposit workflow." The [case study](#)³⁹⁶ is available, and details may be found [here](#).³⁹⁷
- The [University of Southampton](#)³⁹⁸ aims to encourage deposit by developing tools "to help researchers deposit such as import and export functions, XML, reference managers, DOI, and integration with other services such as PubMed and WOK." See details [here](#).³⁹⁹
- [Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas \(CSIC\)](#)⁴⁰⁰ populates its institutional repository with an "OA strategy [that] aims mainly to increase the visibility of its research

output.” Informational sessions are delivered to each department, and deposits are “synchronized” in that metadata are pulled off of departmental websites and input to the repository by IT staff, leaving the researchers with the task of simply uploading the work at the appropriate time. A proposed project is to couple the CSIC’s repository with subject repositories so that authors need to deposit their paper to only one location, with interoperability ensuring that the work appears in all relevant repositories. See details [here](#).⁴⁰¹

- The [Texas Digital Library](#)⁴⁰² created an open source electronic thesis and dissertation management system, [Vireo](#),⁴⁰³ that offers a simple interface for students to submit their completed theses and dissertations. Partial funding for the project was made available through an [Institute of Museum and Library Services](#)⁴⁰⁴ grant. See details [here](#).⁴⁰⁵
- [Symplectic Elements](#)⁴⁰⁶ has been adopted by the [California Digital Library \(CDL\)](#)⁴⁰⁷ to harvest publications subject to the University of California’s [OA Policy](#).⁴⁰⁸ “Elements will closely monitor publication sources...for any new materials published by UC authors” and will “collect as much information about that publication as possible and contact the author(s) by email for confirmation and manuscript upload.” By implementing Elements, CDL will streamline and automate the deposit process. See details [here](#).⁴⁰⁹
- [Pennsylvania State University](#)⁴¹⁰ and [George Mason University](#)⁴¹¹ are partnering to develop enhancements to “[Zotero’s](#)⁴¹² archiving capabilities by linking to [ScholarSphere](#).⁴¹³ Penn State’s institutional repository service...[which] will allow Penn State faculty, students and staff to claim and deposit self-authored works securely in ScholarSphere via Zotero.” An additional anticipated feature will include increased discovery of journal publications through RSS feeds. See details [here](#).⁴¹⁴
- [ETH Zurich](#)⁴¹⁵ has streamlined the deposit of work from [E-Citations](#),⁴¹⁶ the University’s “official reference source...[for] internal annual report[ing],” to [E-Collection](#).⁴¹⁷ the University’s IR. Authors now have “the option [to] ‘Publish in E-Collection’” when they enter citations in E-Citations, “which enables [them] to upload a full text directly for publication in ETH E-Collection.” See details [here](#).⁴¹⁸

(6) Embedding

An institution can encourage deposit by folding the repository into the reporting processes and workflows, making deposit a routine practice. Examples follow:

- Tyler Walters, of [Virginia Tech](#),⁴¹⁹ notes that by “automatically captur[ing] metadata as defined by the data producers and provid[ing] ways for researchers to mark up their data,” institutional repositories “are increasingly being designed to support research groups ‘from beginning to end.’” Additionally, “toolkits designed to support different ways to view and work with data..., support collaboration and communication by research teams, and provide general tools to support working groups” have embedded repositories into research “ecosystems”. See details [here](#).⁴²⁰

- The [University of Southampton](#)⁴²¹ has worked to integrate the IR “into research management systems, which combine publications data with profiles of grant income, research income, and citation metrics...[which] are being used to support REF.” See details [here](#).⁴²²
- The [University of Glasgow](#)⁴²³ aims to “develop a workflow which would enable us to add content systematically on a University-wide basis.” This idea is borne out of the publication gathering that is undertaken for the Research Assessment Exercise; a seamless process could be established in which “each faculty or department would create and maintain a locally held publications database,” from which the repository could then pull content. See details [here](#).⁴²⁴
- Six participants of the “[JISC Repositories: take-up and embedding](#)” (JISCrte) project⁴²⁵ discuss the challenges of embedding repositories, which include “the variety of ways advocating and marketing for the institutional repository; the difficulties met with the technical skills and reaching the PVC agenda; and, the importance of MePrints and the practice of embedding repositories.” The program’s [presentations](#)⁴²⁶ are available, as are project reports from the eight institutions: [De Montfort University](#),⁴²⁷ [University of Hull](#),⁴²⁸ [Glasgow School of Art](#),⁴²⁹ [Middlesex University](#),⁴³⁰ [University of Northampton](#),⁴³¹ [Visual Arts Data Service](#),⁴³² [University of the Creative Arts](#),⁴³³ and [University of the Arts London](#).⁴³⁴ See details [here](#).⁴³⁵
- The “[PURE](#)⁴³⁶ implementations at the [Universities of St Andrews](#)⁴³⁷ and [Aberdeen](#)⁴³⁸ are designed to access their institutional repositories for full-text data,” and the “[University of York](#)⁴³⁹ is also currently implementing PURE, which will be integrated with their existing publications and multimedia repositories.” These institutions are integrating their repositories and Current Research Information Systems, so metadata and full text of research outputs are seamlessly shared. See details [here](#).⁴⁴⁰
- The [University of Aberdeen](#),⁴⁴¹ [Northampton University](#),⁴⁴² and [University of Dundee](#)⁴⁴³ undertook efforts to embed their IRs. See details [here](#),⁴⁴⁴ and a self-assessment tool [here](#).⁴⁴⁵

(7) Funding allocation

An institution can make internal funding depend on deposit in the repository. Funds can be distributed to individual researchers or to a collective unit (e.g., lab, department, school).

- When the [Universidad Carlos III de Madrid](#)⁴⁴⁶ evaluates internal funding requests from department and institute applicants, the university takes into account the commitment of the department/institute to deposit their researchers’ work in the IR. See details [here](#).⁴⁴⁷
- Since [2005](#)⁴⁴⁸ the [University of Minho](#)⁴⁴⁹ has used a system that employs a tiered scoring structure to award money to departments based on their faculty body’s “commitment in the implementation of the [self-archiving] policy.” Points are awarded to each document based on type and date of publication. See [here](#)⁴⁵⁰ and [here](#)⁴⁵¹ for details.
- [Oslo University College](#)⁴⁵² uses a weighted system to award internal research funding to individual researchers: those who deposit their work to the repository receive full credit, whereas those who do not receive half-credit; these points are then used to determine funding distribution. See [here](#)⁴⁵³ for details.

(8) Internal use

When the institution makes decisions on promotion and tenure, or internal funding for faculty members, and asks applicants to list their publications, then it might limit its consideration of research articles to those on deposit in the institutional repository. Examples follow:

- The [University of Minho](#)⁴⁵⁴ requires that internal reporting of research output must link to the full-text version of the work in the IR; this follows directly from the University's strategic plan. The University uses Scopus and Web of Science to monitor author compliance with the institution's policy. See details [here](#).⁴⁵⁵
- The [University of Zurich](#)⁴⁵⁶ “only [includes] publications registered in the repository” in annual reporting. See details [here](#).⁴⁵⁷
- Canada's [National Research Council's Institute for Research in Construction](#)⁴⁵⁸ review committee uses “only official bibliographies generated from the NRC-IRC Publications Database” when considering the promotion of their researchers. See details [here](#).⁴⁵⁹ note this is a toll-access article.
- The [University of Liege](#)⁴⁶⁰ has a policy that only deposited works are factors in “decisions about promoting a researcher, or awarding a grant” and “only those references introduced in ORBi [Open Repository & Bibliography] will be taken into consideration as the official list of publications accompanying any curriculum vitae in all evaluation procedures.” See details [here](#)⁴⁶¹ and [here](#).⁴⁶²
- Also see our recommendation on this point (see p. 26) in the implementation section (see p. 23) of the guide.

(9) Metrics

An institution can provide metrics as a value-added feature of the repository. These metrics can be publicly available or accessible only to the author, and can include download and view counts, among others. Examples follow:

- The [University of Edinburgh](#)⁴⁶³ uses [Google Analytics](#)⁴⁶⁴ to determine how the IR is used and count the number of downloads. The metrics are presented in DSpace with the Google Analytics API. The University of Northampton uses [IRStats](#).⁴⁶⁵ Google Analytics, and custom reports to identify total downloads, usage, and author and administrative activity. Northampton delivers metrics data to deans and research leads. The [University of Bath](#)⁴⁶⁶ uses [Pure](#)⁴⁶⁷ and IRStats for reporting and outreach purposes, to encourage deposit. See details on the methods of all three institutions [here](#).⁴⁶⁸
- The [University of Huddersfield](#)⁴⁶⁹ is an [IRUS-UK](#)⁴⁷⁰ participant. The detailed statistics that the University has collected first from Google Analytics and then [IRStats](#)⁴⁷¹ (an EPrints feature) and now IRUS-UK have helped to increase IR deposits. Reporting to individuals and schools has been particularly effective. See details [here](#)⁴⁷² and learn more about IRUS-UK [here](#).⁴⁷³

- Mark MacGillivray of [Cottage Labs](#)⁴⁷⁴ has detailed methods for collecting and using metrics in an RSP webinar. An example of powerful metrics gathering and display is the [Open Knowledge Foundation's](#)⁴⁷⁵ use of [FacetView](#).⁴⁷⁶ See details [here](#).⁴⁷⁷
- [Plum Analytics's](#)⁴⁷⁸ [PlumX](#)⁴⁷⁹ both “imports records seamlessly from EPrints, dSpace, and bepress” and “feed[s] metrics back into repositories.” [Utah State University](#)⁴⁸⁰ and the [University of Pittsburgh](#)⁴⁸¹ currently use PlumX. Rush Miller of the [University of Pittsburgh](#)⁴⁸² [presented on this project](#)⁴⁸³ at the ALA Annual Conference in 2013. See details [here](#).⁴⁸⁴
- The [University of Nebraska-Lincoln](#)⁴⁸⁵ identifies a sample faculty work to deposit, asks the author for permission to deposit the work, and then delivers download statistics on use. As a result, faculty will occasionally provide additional work for deposit. Additionally, faculty get download statistics monthly on the use of their work in the IR. See details [here](#).⁴⁸⁶
- A [Confederation of Open Access Repositories \(COAR\)](#)⁴⁸⁷ report notes that [PLoS](#)⁴⁸⁸ has made their Article-Level Metrics API available for open use, which allows repositories “to track article usage and exposure through various channels and social networks.” PLoS FAQs may be found [here](#)⁴⁸⁹ and details may be found [here](#).⁴⁹⁰
- The [Chinese Academy of Sciences](#)⁴⁹¹ tracks repository metrics “at the institution-level, research unit-level, or individual researcher-level...[which] can be exported with an excel-formatted file and...used for a variety of purposes in the institution.” See details [here](#).⁴⁹²
- The [University of Bristol](#)⁴⁹³ developed [ResearchRevealed](#).⁴⁹⁴ a tool that “provides researchers and academic support staff with integrated views over publications, people, departments, groups, grants and both internally and externally obtained funding data...[and] allows academics to quickly capture evidence of their own research impact from external websites, recording this alongside their traditional research outputs data.” The project was funded by [JISC](#).⁴⁹⁵ and details may be found [here](#).⁴⁹⁶
- The [University of Michigan](#)⁴⁹⁷-hosted [ICPSR](#)⁴⁹⁸ data repository provides detailed use statistics for each item by unique session (detailing whether just the data, just the documentation, or the data and documentation were downloaded), user (identified by type; i.e., faculty, student, staff, etc.), and downloading institutional member. See comments [here](#).⁴⁹⁹
- The [Queensland University of Technology](#)⁵⁰⁰ provides download statistics to their researchers; see details [here](#).⁵⁰¹
- [Columbia University](#)⁵⁰² encourages participation in the repository by sending faculty monthly statistics on their work that is available in the IR. The figures include COUNTER-compliant downloads from the previous month and cumulative downloads; listen to details [here](#).⁵⁰³
- [Kyushu University](#)⁵⁰⁴ provides citation counts and download numbers for researchers. In addition, the university developed a “researcher database” that is linked with a nuanced feedback system that “analyze[s] co-occurrence on the accesses of the same reader” in usage metrics, which are available to each researcher with authentication. See details [here](#).⁵⁰⁵

- The [University of Rochester's](#)⁵⁰⁶ IR+ provides usage statistics, which are valuable to researchers because “counts provide quantifiable evidence, and [are] a simple and effective way to show how the repository is providing a valuable outlet for their work.” See details [here](#).⁵⁰⁷
- The [Queensland University of Technology's \(QUT's\)](#)⁵⁰⁸ IR supports a statistics feature, which “allows authors to monitor how many times each of their deposited papers is either viewed or downloaded.” See details [here](#).⁵⁰⁹
- The [University of St Andrews](#)⁵¹⁰ provides IR usage statistics. A [blog posting](#)⁵¹¹ by the university's Jackie Proven introduces the details of the page views and download statistics, along with the most viewed works by collection. See details [here](#).⁵¹²
- The [Murdoch University](#)⁵¹³ [repository](#)⁵¹⁴ uses “access statistics...to create a competitive incentive for submission.” See details [here](#).⁵¹⁵
- The [University of Minho](#)⁵¹⁶ offers “value-added services for both authors and readers,” which include giving researchers the ability “to check various types of useful statistics about their communities and their deposited information items.” The range of statistics include “how many times their deposited items had been downloaded...the countries from which those downloads originated and...how many people read the metadata for the items but had not downloaded the items themselves,” and more. See details [here](#).⁵¹⁷ and additional details [here](#).⁵¹⁸
- The [University of Southampton](#)⁵¹⁹ provides an “integrated statistics service” because “[a]uthors are often keen to know how many people have been accessing their work.” See details [here](#).⁵²⁰
- [De Montfort University Leicester \(DMU\)](#)⁵²¹ implemented “[u]pgrades to DSpace allowing for display of statistics on all items.” See details [here](#).⁵²²
- The [University of California](#)⁵²³ provides usage information in eScholarship. See details [here](#).⁵²⁴
- In an effort to populate its IR, the [Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas \(CSIC\)](#)⁵²⁵ has added “a complete module of statistics...[that lets] the authors measure the effects of depositing their work in [Digital.CSIC](#)⁵²⁶ on its visibility.” See details [here](#).⁵²⁷ and additional details [here](#).⁵²⁸
- The [University of Southampton](#)⁵²⁹ encourages author deposit to the institutional repository by providing “usage statistics...to research groups and individuals demonstrating research impact.” See details [here](#).⁵³⁰
- Arthur Sale, of the [University of Tasmania](#),⁵³¹ discusses citation metrics as a successful means of advocating for deposit. He mentions Anne-Will Harzing's [Publish or Perish](#)⁵³² tool as a way to illustrate “how online access...can be used to develop sophisticated metrics of research impact.” These metrics may be used to “deliver a research record summary” for each researcher, which may be used in performance evaluation (though Sale cautions against using institutional repository metrics for promotion). See details [here](#).⁵³³

- [Butler University](#)⁵³⁴ uses download metrics, which provide immediate feedback to authors (and deans) on usage, and efforts of the [University of Wollongong](#)⁵³⁵ include “activity reports for every participating department [which include] number of items uploaded to the repository, number of downloads, most active authors, and ‘fun facts.’” These reports offer authors “a sense of competition and accomplishment,” and deans a measure of their department’s output, which can aid in promotion decisions. See details [here](#).⁵³⁶
- The [University of Manchester](#)⁵³⁷ is making view and citation metrics available to researchers (requiring authentication), and will begin offering “usage and deposit data as appropriate on public-facing web pages.” See details [here](#).⁵³⁸

(10) Personalization

An institution can create a customizable web presence to feature researchers and their work in the IR. These efforts can potentially create a sense of personalization and community within the broader context of an institutional repository. Examples follow:

- [Boise State University](#)⁵³⁹ offers “individual researcher pages called SelectedWorks sites that highlight the scholarly accomplishments of each faculty member.” See details [here](#).⁵⁴⁰
- A [Confederation of Open Access Repositories \(COAR\)](#)⁵⁴¹ report notes that the [University of Hong Kong](#)⁵⁴² supplies “ResearcherPages” to all faculty, which include “research interests, membership in professional societies and community service, contact information, networks of collaboration...publications...achievements, supervision of research postgraduate students, grants and extensive external bibliometrics data.” This same report notes an EPrints plugin, [MePrints](#).⁵⁴³ which “extends the user aspect of EPrints with user profiles and homepages,” as well as [Vivo](#).⁵⁴⁴ “a semantic web platform for researcher administrative information that is being integrated with repositories.” See details [here](#).⁵⁴⁵
- [Columbia University](#)⁵⁴⁶ encourages participation in the repository by creating an individual bit.ly for each faculty member’s collection in the repository, which the researcher can then use on grant applications, CVs, and posters; listen to details [here](#).⁵⁴⁷
- Findings from a case study of the [University of Illinois](#),⁵⁴⁸ [University of Massachusetts](#),⁵⁴⁹ [University of Michigan](#),⁵⁵⁰ [University of Minnesota](#),⁵⁵¹ and [Ohio State University](#)⁵⁵² indicated that “the development of faculty homepages...are quite popular” for increasing deposit participation. See details [here](#).⁵⁵³
- The use of tools that “unambiguously connect [content] to their creators”, such as [Open Researcher & Contributor ID \(ORCID\)](#),⁵⁵⁴ are listed as motivators for self-deposit from an active researcher at [Hannover Medical School](#).⁵⁵⁵ See details [here](#).⁵⁵⁶
- The [Royal College of Art](#)⁵⁵⁷ uses [MePrints](#),⁵⁵⁸ which “provides an editable profile as the user’s first point of entry.” See details [here](#)⁵⁵⁹ and [here](#).⁵⁶⁰

- [China Agricultural University's](#)⁵⁶¹ IR offers “integrated information of individual faculty and staff members, showing an introduction to the individual, media coverage, published books and papers, theses and dissertations of graduate students, teaching activities, research projects and achievements, patents, etc.” See details [here](#).⁵⁶²
- The [NARCIS](#)⁵⁶³ collaborative project in the Netherlands and the [University of Rochester](#)⁵⁶⁴ are two examples of institutions that “[to] attract researchers...have built researcher bibliographies on top of IR platform, as an alternative access point.” See details [here](#).⁵⁶⁵
- The [University of Illinois](#),⁵⁶⁶ [University of Massachusetts](#),⁵⁶⁷ [University of Michigan](#),⁵⁶⁸ [University of Minnesota](#),⁵⁶⁹ and [Ohio State University](#)⁵⁷⁰ have varied “successful strategies” of securing content, one of is “the development of faculty homepages which are quite popular.” See details [here](#).⁵⁷¹
- The [University of Glasgow](#)⁵⁷² works to embed the repository “into the fabric of the institution”. Included in these efforts is the “feeding institutional research profile pages” and “[m]anaging author disambiguation.” See details [here](#).⁵⁷³
- [University of Nebraska-Lincoln](#)⁵⁷⁴ has added collections of archival material from emeritus professors to the University's IR; for example, a former biological sciences professor, Paul Johnsgard, offered several articles and books for digitization. See details [here](#).⁵⁷⁵
- Arthur Sale, of the [University of Tasmania](#),⁵⁷⁶ suggests including a means for researchers to link to an up-to-date and comprehensive list of their deposited papers on their personal website, and provides an [example](#)⁵⁷⁷ of his own work. See details [here](#).⁵⁷⁸
- The [University of Rochester's](#)⁵⁷⁹ IR+ includes “contributor pages,” which display “statistics... download counts...[and] the most popular work” and give faculty members the ability to “add and remove files and correct metadata”. The University also added a “user workspace” that gives researchers “their own web-based file system” to “download-modify-upload” and share works in progress, as well as a “portfolio page” that “gives users control over the presentation of their work.” See details [here](#).⁵⁸⁰ and additional resources [here](#)⁵⁸¹ and [here](#).⁵⁸²

(11) Proxy deposit or harvesting

An institution can implement complementary methods for gathering content for the repository, in addition to author deposits. These methods can include hiring student workers and dedicating staff time to depositing work on the behalf of authors, partnering with publishers to ingest institutional content into the IR, and pulling content from author websites. Examples follow:

- Following successful outreach efforts, the [University of the Arts London](#)⁵⁸³ collected and deposited faculty work to the IR; this effort took time, but created a sort of “tipping point” when faculty saw their populated spaces in the IR. See details [here](#).⁵⁸⁴

- A [Confederation of Open Access Repositories \(COAR\)](#)⁵⁸⁵ report notes that [Virginia Tech](#),⁵⁸⁶ the [University of Barcelona](#),⁵⁸⁷ and the [Chinese Academy of Sciences](#)⁵⁸⁸ harvest work from BioMed Central. See details [here](#).⁵⁸⁹
- The [University of Hong Kong](#)⁵⁹⁰ has developed a DSpace [module](#)⁵⁹¹ that has “the ability to manage, collect and expose data about all the research aspects” which “produces a smooth integration between DSpace items (publications) and other CRIS entities.” See details [here](#).⁵⁹²
- [Boise State University](#)⁵⁹³ uses a “mediated-deposit model” where library staff find potential depositable works and investigate publisher licensing terms, and then contact faculty for the document to submit to the IR. See details [here](#).⁵⁹⁴
- The [University of Miland](#)⁵⁹⁵ has integrated their “research information system with the institutional repository,” which gathers data from across the university. “Since 2009, it has been mandatory for faculty to upload the metadata from their publications, and full-text is recommended whenever possible.” See details [here](#).⁵⁹⁶
- The [University of Nebraska-Lincoln](#)⁵⁹⁷ requests faculty CVs and identifies work that can be pulled and posted from a faculty member’s website. See details [here](#).⁵⁹⁸
- As noted in a [Confederation of Open Access Repositories \(COAR\)](#)⁵⁹⁹ report, [Concordia University](#)⁶⁰⁰ “uses publisher’s alerts, maintains a Refworks database of new faculty publications, tags relevant citations, and uses this all as the starting point for faculty outreach to populate their repository.”
- [Stellenbosch University](#)⁶⁰¹ is [auditing](#)⁶⁰² [SUNScholar](#)⁶⁰³ to ensure that it is reliable and authoritative. Included in the audit is a scan of the IR’s “Generally Accepted Repository Practice,” which details the [automatic](#)⁶⁰⁴ and [manual](#)⁶⁰⁵ methods for ingesting work into SUNScholar. See details [here](#).⁶⁰⁶
- The [Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively \(RUBRIC\)](#)⁶⁰⁷ project developed “a collection of Python scripts and xsl transformations that enable data migration from various data sources to institutional repositories”; see details of this migration toolkit [here](#).⁶⁰⁸
- [Columbia University](#)⁶⁰⁹ encourages participation in the repository by providing a CV review service for faculty: library staff review publications from an author’s CV and then contact the faculty member for files that may be deposited to the repository; listen to details [here](#).⁶¹⁰
- The [College of Wooster](#)⁶¹¹ has developed a [script](#)⁶¹² “that will automate PDF permissions lookup in Sherpa Romeo,” which enables the user to easily determine whether a publisher’s PDF of a work may be downloaded and deposited to an IR. The script is available for download [here](#).⁶¹³
- Findings from a case study of the [University of Illinois](#),⁶¹⁴ [University of Massachusetts](#),⁶¹⁵ [University of Michigan](#),⁶¹⁶ [University of Minnesota](#),⁶¹⁷ and [Ohio State University](#)⁶¹⁸ indicated that “negotiating with publishers to include faculty content” in the institution’s IR is a successful way to recruit content. See details [here](#).⁶¹⁹

- The [Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas \(CSIC\)](#)⁶²⁰ provides a “Mediated Archiving Service” to their faculty by which the library deposits work on behalf of researchers. See details [here](#).⁶²¹
- The [Australian National University](#)⁶²² offers a discussion of harvesting work for local deposit. See details [here](#)⁶²³ and [here](#).⁶²⁴
- [MIT](#)⁶²⁵ efforts to increase content in their IR follow a “12-point strategy,” including the use of “automated ingest tools” and “scrap[ing] the MIT domain to see what other papers they find within their institutional domain.” See details [here](#).⁶²⁶
- [MIT](#)⁶²⁷ also partners with [BioMed Central](#)⁶²⁸ to harvest “the final published version” of researcher works. The SWORD protocol is used to push the works from BioMed Central to MIT’s repository. See details [here](#)⁶²⁹ and details on the Institute’s extended publisher partnerships [here](#).⁶³⁰
- The [University of Tromsø’s](#)⁶³¹ library harvests work for the repository by reviewing publications reports and consulting DOAJ and SHERPA/RoMEO to determine whether a work may be deposited. See details [here](#).⁶³²
- [Harvard](#)⁶³³ employs students as [Open Access Fellows](#)⁶³⁴ to “help faculty to make deposits into DASH, answer questions about the Open Access Policies, and help depositors complete metadata descriptions”. See details [here](#).⁶³⁵
- Canada’s [National Research Council’s Institute for Research in Construction’s](#)⁶³⁶ library serves as a “technical and administrative” manager of the deposit of works to the repository. As such, the “staff enters all bibliographic information, creates standardized PDFs for the Web, ‘alerts’ clients to new material available and verifies that new publications are indexed by Internet search engines.” See details [here](#).⁶³⁷ Note: This is a toll-access article.
- The [Cyprus University of Technology’s](#)⁶³⁸ [Ktisis](#)⁶³⁹ repository offers “two existing available methods for submitting an item...either by sending the work by email or [by] using the self-archiving method.” See details [here](#).⁶⁴⁰
- The [London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine \(LSHTM\)](#)⁶⁴¹ [Research Online](#)⁶⁴² repository “automatically imports records for all current LSHTM staff research which is published [and]...If an article is from an open access journal or...[is paid] open access....the publisher’s full text PDF of the article” will be ingested. See details [here](#).⁶⁴³
- The [University of Glasgow’s](#)⁶⁴⁴ [Daedalus](#)⁶⁴⁵ project team has used different methods for harvesting work: they have contacted faculty who post their work on their personal websites, asking permission to collect this work for the repository; pulled work from PubMed Central and requested deposit permission from the author; and searched journals that grant deposit permission for Glasgow-authored works, whom they then approached to confirm whether the author would grant deposit. See details [here](#).⁶⁴⁶
- The [University of Edinburgh’s](#)⁶⁴⁷ library deposits work for the university’s authors, when requested; and the University of Glasgow actively collects content, both from “faculty and departmental websites” and “publishers that allow self-archiving.” See details [here](#).⁶⁴⁸

- In a case study of three anonymous libraries and their approaches to filling their institutional repositories with content, one of the profiled institutions “brokered arrangements directly with publishers to acquire copyrighted, peer-reviewed journal papers written by their faculty” and “coordinated with departments for bulk ingests.” See details [here](#).⁶⁴⁹
- The [California Institute of Technology](#)⁶⁵⁰ harvests “low-hanging fruit” for the repository, which includes “the intellectual heritage...from the material which presents the least difficulties with respect to publisher permissions” and “[o]ther rich sources of readily available content includ[ing]...technical report series, working paper collections, theses, and dissertations.” See details [here](#).⁶⁵¹
- At [Southampton University](#)⁶⁵² deposit efforts are varied because the institutional repository is distributed across the university’s different schools. One method that is used is for departments to appoint administrators to deposit works for authors. See details [here](#).⁶⁵³
- [CERN’s](#)⁶⁵⁴ high deposit rate can be attributed to several factors, including the following: “Departments are responsible for depositing content into the system mainly on behalf of its authors” and “Content not deposited by CERN researchers is harvested by the library.” See details [here](#).⁶⁵⁵
- The [University of St Andrews](#)⁶⁵⁶ repository uses a new “Current Research Information System (CRIS),” which works together with the repository. With the CRIS, “the library can monitor the research outputs added to PURE as researchers update their publication lists, contacting people who are engaging with the system.” See details here and information the University’s work on the similar, but now-defunct, MERIT project [here](#).⁶⁵⁷
- The [William & Mary Law School](#)⁶⁵⁸ repository, at its inception, was filled by “a small army of student assistants...[who added] almost 5,000 documents...in the first six months of the repository’s existence.” See details [here](#).⁶⁵⁹
- The [Texas Digital Library](#)⁶⁶⁰ created an open source electronic thesis and dissertation management system, [Vireo](#),⁶⁶¹ providing “an expert management interface that lets graduate offices and libraries move the ETD through the approval workflow and publish it in an institutional repository” once a student has submitted it for approval. See details [here](#).⁶⁶² and instillations of Vireo at [Texas A&M](#),⁶⁶³ [Texas Tech](#),⁶⁶⁴ and the [University of Texas at Austin](#).⁶⁶⁵
- [Carnegie Mellon University](#)⁶⁶⁶ may be exploring a change to its the annual publications reporting system, that is, by requiring authors to include metadata and a copy of the final version of their work with each publication that would allow for harvest by library staff. See details [here](#).⁶⁶⁷
- The [Botswana College of Agriculture \(BCA\)](#)⁶⁶⁸ library staff undertake efforts of “content harvesting, digitization of print materials, and the creation of metadata,” which populate the repository. [Note: BCA’s institutional repository is not publicly released yet; currently it is being used as an internal resource, which will presumably change once the “development” stage is complete.] See details [here](#).⁶⁶⁹

- Repositories from the [University of Melbourne](#),⁶⁷⁰ [University of Queensland](#),⁶⁷¹ [Queensland University of Technology](#),⁶⁷² [University of Southampton](#),⁶⁷³ [University of Strathclyde](#),⁶⁷⁴ [University of Glasgow](#),⁶⁷⁵ and [Lund University](#)⁶⁷⁶ were studied, and rather than “disciplinary culture” being a strong indicator of deposit rate, an institutional mandate and a strong liaison program, which offers deposit support, is “an efficient and effective practice that is capable of making the content size of an IR larger.” See details [here](#).⁶⁷⁷
- [CERN’s Library](#)⁶⁷⁸ “believes it retrieves bibliographic records for almost 100% of CERN’s own documents.” The high rate of full-text articles in CDS is attributable to a long-standing policy and digitization efforts by the library staff; additionally, CERN has permission from the American Physical Society to upload CERN-authored content to the CDS. See details [here](#).⁶⁷⁹

Talking about policy

1. **Academic freedom** p. 53
2. **“Compliance”** p. 54
3. **“Institutional repository”** p. 55
4. **“Mandate”** p. 55
5. **“Opt-out” and “opt-in”** p. 56
6. **“Waivers”** p. 56

(1) Academic freedom

Some faculty object that a draft OA policy would infringe their academic freedom.

- If they object that it will limit their freedom to submit new work to the journals of their choice, then they are mistaking a green policy (as recommended here) for a gold policy. They are mistaking deposit in OA repositories for submission to OA journals. Help faculty understand the difference between requiring deposit in a certain kind of repository and requiring submission to a certain kind of journal, and help them understand that the policy is limited to the former and does not extend to the latter.
- If they object that some journals will not allow OA on the university’s terms, and that faculty will effectively be barred from publishing in those journals, then they are forgetting about the waiver option (see p. 15). Faculty may submit their work to such a journal; if it is accepted, faculty may publish in that journal simply by obtaining a waiver, which the university will always grant, no questions asked. In fact, preserving faculty freedom to submit new work to the journals of their choice is the primary rationale for including the waiver option. Be explicit in reassuring faculty that they remain free to publish anywhere and remain free to decide for or against OA for each of their publications.

- If they object that it will diminish their rights or control over their work, then they don't understand the rights-retention aspect of the policy, the feature of the policy allowing the university to transfer rights back to the author (see p. 18), the terms of standard publishing contracts, or all three. Authors sign away most of their rights under standard publishing contracts. In fact, increasing author rights and control is the primary rationale of a rights-retention OA policy. Be explicit in reassuring faculty that they will have far more rights and control over their work under this policy than under a standard (or even progressive) publishing contract.
- If they object that it will give the university ownership of their work, then they don't understand non-exclusive rights, the terms of standard publishing contracts, or both. The policy grants no exclusive rights to the institution, only non-exclusive rights. By contrast, faculty routinely grant exclusive rights to publishers through standard publishing agreements.
- If they object that they will be subject to a new form of coercion, then they are overlooking the waiver option, misinterpreting the word "mandate", or both. If some people call the policy a "mandate", it's only because the policy is stronger than a request or encouragement. But it's not a mandate in any other sense, and doesn't call itself a mandate. The waiver option means that faculty retain the freedom to decide for or against OA for every one of their publications. Where the word "mandate" may be a problem, don't use the word, and where the word is already causing problems, help faculty focus on the actual substance of the policy rather than the implications of a very imperfect label for the policy. (More under "Mandate" below. (See p. 59.)
- These objections are especially common on campuses where faculty distrust of administrators runs high. Sometimes faculty do understand the green/gold distinction, the waiver option, rights-retention, and non-exclusive rights. But when they distrust administrators, they often see a draft OA policy as an attempted power grab by the administration. When this is a risk, be especially clear on the points above (the green/gold distinction, the waiver option, rights-retention, and non-exclusive rights). But also be clear on the fact that the policy is a faculty initiative. It is drafted by faculty and will be voted upon by faculty. Be clear that it enhances author prerogatives (control over their work and distribution channels for their work), while preserving their freedom to decide for or against OA and preserving their freedom to submit their work to the journals of their choice. These are the reasons why so many OA policies have been approved by [unanimous faculty votes](#).⁶⁸⁰
- At schools where faculty worry that administrators might claim control over faculty publications under the work-for-hire doctrine, it helps to point out that the kind of policy recommended here reaffirms that these rights belong to faculty. Through the vote on the policy, faculty grant (non-exclusive) rights to the institution. This act presupposes that it is the faculty's prerogative to grant or withhold these rights.

(2) "Compliance"

Policies of the type recommended here have two main components: permissions and deposits.

- On the first component (permissions, licenses, rights-retention), compliance reaches 100% as soon as the policy is adopted.

- On the second component (deposits in the repository), compliance always requires time, and typically requires education, assistance, and incentives. But even though the deposit rate generally starts low and grows slowly, and occupies most of the attention of those charged with implementing a policy, it doesn't follow that the deposit rate is the only component of the compliance rate.
- You could say that waivers are a third component of the policy. But it's probably better to bring in waivers as potential modifiers of the first two components. The permissions component is waivable and the deposit component is not waivable. In any case, campus leaders should make clear that faculty who obtain waivers are still complying with the policy. They are not violating the letter or spirit of the policy. The policy deliberately accommodates those who need or want waivers.

(3) “Institutional repository”

University OA policies generally require deposit in the institutional repository, and we recommend that practice. In this sense, an institutional repository tries to gather the research output of an institution, as opposed to a central, subject, or disciplinary repository, which tries to gather the research output of a field. When we're discussing different kinds of repository, “institutional repository” is unambiguous and unfrighting.

However, many faculty do not realize that institutional repositories are indexed by major (academic and non-academic) search engines, and are interoperable with other repositories. Many faculty think that an institutional repository is a walled garden or a silo of content only visible to people who know the repository exists and take the trouble to make a special visit and run a special search. In addition, most faculty identify more with their field than their institution. Hence, when we're discussing the terms of a university OA policy, the term “institutional repository” may reinforce false assumptions that deposited works are institution-bound, invisible, and provincially identified with an institution more than with the author or topic. In discussing university OA policies, then, it may be better to emphasize the sense which institutional repositories are OA, open for indexing by any search engine, and interoperable with other repositories. They do not wall off content into institutional silos but openly distribute content using institutional resources. They are designed to expose content to searchers, and most readers will find the repository articles through global, cross-repository searches than through local searches or local browsing. For all these reasons, many faculty will find “open-access repository” and “repository” more illuminating and less confusing terms than “institutional repository”.

(4) “Mandate”

If the word “mandate” suggests commands or coercion incompatible with academic freedom, then avoid it. The kind of policy recommended here is not implemented through commands or coercion. First, it is self-imposed by faculty vote. Second, it contains a waiver option and merely shifts the default. It would be a mistake to let the understandable desire to avoid the ugly implications of the word “mandate” lead faculty to defeat a policy that was not a mandate in the ugly sense. The kind of policy recommended here preserves faculty freedom to choose for or against OA for every publication.

- On the other hand, the policy recommended here is considerably stronger than a mere request or encouragement. The chief rationale for the word “mandate” is that English doesn’t seem to give us better options for a policy that goes well beyond requests and encouragement and yet stops short of commands and coercion. (If you have a better alternative, please come forward!)
- For more detail, see Peter Suber, [Open Access](#),⁶⁸¹ MIT Press, 2012, Section 4.2, [“Digression on the word ‘Mandate’”](#),⁶⁸² pp. 86-90.

In any case, the deposit expectation or commitment is only one part of the policy. Don’t talk about the policy as if deposit in the repository were the only part or the main part. It’s one of two equally important parts. The key second part is rights retention by the institution and author. As we noted in the entry on transferring rights back to the author, the kind of policy recommended here increases faculty freedom to reuse their own work.

(5) “Opt-out” and “opt-in”

A waiver option creates an “opt-out” policy. In that sense it “shifts the default” from lack of permission for OA to permission for OA. After a rights-retention policy is adopted, faculty who don’t lift a finger are granting the institution permission to make their future work OA. If they want a different outcome, they must lift a finger and obtain a waiver. Faculty who object to opt-out OA policies sometimes believe that the default will be difficult to shift, or that their request to do so might be denied. But this depends on the policy. We recommend that that the policy make clear that the institution “will” grant opt-outs or waivers, whenever a faculty member asks it to do so, not merely that it “may” grant waivers.

Some institutions adopt what they call “opt-in” policies. But in effect they already had opt-in policies. Faculty already had the right to opt in to green OA, or to take the initiative to deposit their work in an OA repository. If the university didn’t have an institutional repository, then faculty could deposit in a disciplinary repository. Hence the proper opposite of an “opt-out” policy is not an “opt-in” policy, but either a non-policy (which is weaker) or a no-waiver policy (which is stronger).

(6) “Waivers”

The university should make works in the repository OA whenever it has permission to do so. The kind of rights-retention policy we recommend here is one source of permission. When a faculty member obtains a waiver for a given article, then the university does not have OA permission from the policy for that article. But if the university has permission from another source, such as the publisher, then it doesn’t need permission from the policy. A waiver of the license or permission under the university policy doesn’t waive the license or permission that the university may have from the publisher. Hence, no one should talk about waivers as if they flatly block OA permission for a given work. They only block OA permission from the policy, not from other sources. In fact, policy proponents should be explicit that the institution will make deposited work OA whenever it has permission to do so.

- Some faculty will overlook or misinterpret the waiver option and object that the policy limits their options and infringes their academic freedom. (We respond to this objection in the entry on academic freedom above.) (See p. 57)
- Some faculty who are strong proponents of OA will raise the opposite objection, and argue that the waiver option guts the policy and should be deleted. They believe the waiver rate will be high—for example, 40%, 60%, or 80%—when the experience at every school with a waiver option is that the waiver rate is low. At both Harvard and MIT it's below 5%. Moreover, removing the waiver option will make it impossible to answer certain objections based on academic freedom. Not only could an unwaivable policy infringe academic freedom, it could fail to muster the votes needed to pass. Don't make the perfect an enemy of the good, and don't underestimate the ways in which shifting the default can change behavior on a large scale.

If you accept our recommendation (see p. 15) that waivers should apply only to the grant of rights to the institution (a.k.a “the license”), and not to deposit in the repository, then it's better to speak about “waiving the license” than “waiving the policy”.

(7) “Also see”

Also see the recommendations on separating the issues (see p. 20) and educating faculty before the vote. (See p. 21.)

Revising this guide

1. Substance p. 57

2. Procedure p. 58

(1) Substance

Here are some topics under discussion. In some cases, we're still working out our recommendations. In some cases, good practices are hard to identify or yet to emerge.

- How should universities assure OA for approved theses and dissertations?
 - Until the guide adds entries on theses and dissertations, see Recommendation 1.2 of the [ten-year anniversary statement of the Budapest Open Access Initiative](#)⁶⁸³ (September 2012): “Every institution of higher education offering advanced degrees should have a policy assuring that future theses and dissertations are deposited upon acceptance in the institution's OA repository. At the request of students who want to publish their work, or seek a patent on a patentable discovery, policies should grant reasonable delays rather than permanent exemptions.” Also see Peter Suber, [Open access to electronic theses and dissertations \(ETDs\)](#),⁶⁸⁴ SPARC Open Access Newsletter, July 2, 2006.

(2) Procedure

The guide is written and edited by [Stuart Shieber](#)⁶⁸⁵ and [Peter Suber](#)⁶⁸⁶ in consultation with a growing list of experts. For the latest list, see the Preface. (See p. 8.)

To suggest a revision, or to be listed as an endorsing organization, please [contact](#) [Stuart and Peter](#)⁶⁸⁷ directly.

Other formats for this guide

The most current and authoritative version of the guide is the wiki edition <http://bit.ly/goodoa>.⁶⁸⁸ We launched it in October 2012 and update it regularly.

For those who prefer other formats, we periodically publish print and PDF editions.

- We released the first print and PDF editions in October 2013, and the second print and PDF editions in October 2015.
- The 2013 editions used the text as it stood on September 26, 2013, after roughly one year of evolution on the wiki. The 2015 editions use the text as it stood on September 7, 2015, after roughly three years of evolution on the wiki.
- Unlike the wiki edition, the print and PDF editions use continuous pagination. Like the wiki edition, they stand under CC-BY licenses. Like the wiki edition, the PDF editions have active links in the text. The print editions use endnotes and URLs where the other two editions use active links. To support those who'd like to print the PDF, the PDF editions include the same endnotes as the print editions.
- Here's the October 2013 [PDF edition](#).⁶⁸⁹
- Here's the October 2015 [PDF edition](#).⁶⁹⁰
- To obtain a copy of the 2015 print edition, [email Amanda Page](#)⁶⁹¹ your snail-mail address.

Additional resources

1. **Policies of the kind recommended in the guide p. 59**
2. **Other recommendations for university OA policies p. 61**
3. **University OA policies in general p. 63**

(1) Policies of the kind recommendation in the guide

Chronological by date of adoption. Links point to policies, not institutional home pages.

For those considering adopting their own policies, we recommend starting with the current [Harvard model policy](#),⁶⁹² which incorporates the latest recommended practices described in this guide. HOAP project staff are [available for consultation](#)⁶⁹³ on drafting as well.

1. [Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences](#),⁶⁹⁴ February 12, 2008
2. [Harvard Law School](#),⁶⁹⁵ May 1, 2008
3. [Stanford University School of Education](#),⁶⁹⁶ June 26, 2008
4. [Harvard Kennedy School of Government](#),⁶⁹⁷ March 10, 2009
5. [Massachusetts Institute of Technology \(MIT\)](#),⁶⁹⁸ March 18, 2009
6. [University of Kansas](#),⁶⁹⁹ April 30, 2009
7. [University of Oregon, Library Faculty](#),⁷⁰⁰ May 7, 2009
8. [University of Oregon, Department of Romance Languages](#),⁷⁰¹ May 14, 2009
9. [Harvard Graduate School of Education](#),⁷⁰² June 1, 2009
10. [Trinity University](#),⁷⁰³ October 27, 2009
11. [Oberlin College](#),⁷⁰⁴ November 18, 2009
12. [Wake Forest University](#),⁷⁰⁵ Library Faculty, February 1, 2010
13. [Harvard Business School](#),⁷⁰⁶ February 12, 2010
14. [Rollins College](#),⁷⁰⁷ February 25, 2010
15. [Duke University](#),⁷⁰⁸ March 18, 2010
16. [University of Puerto Rico Law School](#),⁷⁰⁹ March 24, 2010

17. [Harvard Divinity School](#),⁷¹⁰ November 15, 2010
18. [The University of Hawaii-Manoa](#),⁷¹¹ Faculty Senate December 2010, Final adoption March 2012
19. [Columbia University, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory](#),⁷¹² December 22, 2010
20. [Strathmore University](#),⁷¹³ c. February 2011
21. [Emory University](#),⁷¹⁴ March 15, 2011
22. [Harvard Graduate School of Design](#),⁷¹⁵ March 20, 2011
23. [Columbia University Libraries](#),⁷¹⁶ June 1, 2011
24. [Princeton University](#),⁷¹⁷ September 19, 2011
25. [Hope College](#),⁷¹⁸ October 15, 2011
26. [Bifröst University](#)⁷¹⁹ (in English), or in [Icelandic](#),⁷²⁰ first vote May 2011; confirmed January 2012
27. [Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology](#),⁷²¹ c. March 2012
28. [Utah State University](#),⁷²² April 2012
29. [Miami University of Ohio, Library faculty](#),⁷²³ May 14, 2012
30. [University of California – San Francisco](#),⁷²⁴ May 21, 2012
31. [University of Massachusetts Medical School](#),⁷²⁵ July 27, 2012
32. [McGill University Librarians](#),⁷²⁶ c. October 2012
33. [Rutgers University](#),⁷²⁷ October 19, 2012
34. [Harvard School of Public Health](#),⁷²⁸ November 26, 2012
35. [Georgia Institute of Technology](#),⁷²⁹ November 27, 2012
36. [Olin College of Engineering](#),⁷³⁰ November 28, 2012
37. [University of Nairobi](#),⁷³¹ December 2012
38. [Wellesley College](#),⁷³² February 6, 2013
39. [College of Wooster](#),⁷³³ March 4, 2013

40. [Amherst College](#),⁷³⁴ March 5, 2013
41. [University of Rhode Island](#),⁷³⁵ March 21, 2013
42. [Allegheny College](#),⁷³⁶ May 16, 2013
43. [Stanford doctoral students at the Graduate School of Education](#),⁷³⁷ May 24, 2013
44. [California Institute of Technology](#),⁷³⁸ June 10, 2013
45. [Oregon State University](#),⁷³⁹ June 13, 2013
46. [University of California](#),⁷⁴⁰ July 24, 2013
47. [Bryn Mawr College](#),⁷⁴¹ December 11, 2013
48. [King Abdullah University of Science and Technology \(KAUST\)](#),⁷⁴² July 1, 2014
49. [Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis \(IUPUI\)](#),⁷⁴³ October 7, 2014
50. [Harvard Medical School](#),⁷⁴⁴ June 18, 2014
51. [Berkman Center for Internet & Society](#),⁷⁴⁵ [Harvard University](#),⁷⁴⁶ October 9, 2014
52. [Shorenstein Center on Media, Politics and Public Policy](#),⁷⁴⁷ [Harvard University](#),⁷⁴⁸ December 2014
53. [University of Minnesota](#),⁷⁴⁹ December 2014
54. [Boston University](#),⁷⁵⁰ February 11, 2015
55. [University of Delaware](#),⁷⁵¹ April 6, 2015
56. [University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill](#),⁷⁵² April 24, 2015

(2) Other recommendations for university OA policies

- BOAI (Budapest Open Access Initiative), [Ten years on from the Budapest Open Access Initiative: setting the default to open](#),⁷⁵³ September 12, 2012. The ten-year anniversary statement from the BOAI, with recommendations for policy and practice.
- Martin Borchert and Paula Callan, [Strategies for gaining and maintaining academic support for the institutional open access repository](#),⁷⁵⁴ April 14, 2013.
- COAR (Confederation of Open Access Repositories), [Incentives, Integration, and Mediation: Sustainable Practices for Populating Repositories](#),⁷⁵⁵ June 18, 2013.

- Ellen Finnie Duranceau and Sue Kriegsman, [Implementing Open Access Policies Using Institutional Repositories](#),⁷⁵⁶ chapter 5 of Pamela Bluh and Cindy Hepfer (eds.), *The Institutional Repository: Benefits and Challenges*, American Library Association, Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS), January 2013.
- EOS (Enabling Open Scholarship), [Formulating an institutional Open Access policy](#).⁷⁵⁷
- EUA (European University Association), [EUA's Open Access Checklist for Universities: A Practical Guide on Implementation](#),⁷⁵⁸ 2015.
- Stevan Harnad, [Integrating Institutional and Funder Open Access Mandates: Belgian Model, Open Access Archivangelism](#),⁷⁵⁹ December 23, 2011.
- Stevan Harnad, [Waking OA's "Slumbering Giant": The University's Mandate To Mandate Open Access](#),⁷⁶⁰ *New Review of Information Networking* 14, 1 (2008) pp. 51-68.
- Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication, [Harvard Model Open Access Policy](#),⁷⁶¹ Annotated. Last updated, October 10, 2012.
- JISC (Joint Information Systems Committee), [Your institution and open access](#).⁷⁶² June 2013.
- MedOANet (Mediterranean Open Access Network), [MedOANet Guidelines for implementing open access policies: For research performing and research funding organizations](#),⁷⁶³ November 2013. [Now available in seven languages](#).⁷⁶⁴
- OASIS (Open Access Scholarly Information Sourcebook), [Developing an Institutional Open Access Policy](#),⁷⁶⁵ April 7, 2012.
- RCAAP (Repositório Científico de Acesso Aberto de Portugal), [Open Access Policies Kit](#),⁷⁶⁶ March 31, 2011.
- Arthur Sale, Marc Couture, Eloy Rodrigues, Leslie Carr, and Stevan Harnad, [Open Access Mandates and the "Fair Dealing" Button](#),⁷⁶⁷ in: Rosemary J. Coombe and Darren Wershler, eds., *Dynamic Fair Dealing: Creating Canadian Culture Online*, 2012.
- Stuart Shieber, [The Occasional Pamphlet](#),⁷⁶⁸ Blog entries on scholarly communication.
- SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition), [A SPARC Guide for Campus Action](#),⁷⁶⁹ April 25, 2012.
- SPARC, [Campus Open Access Policies project](#),⁷⁷⁰ launched August 5, 2009.
- Peter Suber, [OA policy options for funding agencies and universities](#),⁷⁷¹ SPARC Open Access Newsletter, February 2, 2009.
- Peter Suber, [Three principles for university open access policies](#),⁷⁷² SPARC Open Access Newsletter, April 2, 2008.
- SUNScholar, [Practical guidelines for starting an institutional repository](#),⁷⁷³ Stellenbosch University, July 2012.

- Alma Swan, [Policy Guidelines for the Development and Promotion of Open Access](#),⁷⁷⁴ UNESCO, March 2012.
- UK OAIG (UK Open Access Implementation Group), [Information and Guidance](#),⁷⁷⁵ December 2011.

(3) University OA policies in general

- [AOASG](#)⁷⁷⁶ (Australasian Open Access Support Group) [page on Open Access Policies](#).⁷⁷⁷
- [COAPI](#)⁷⁷⁸ (Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions), [Institution Contacts and their Open Access Policies](#).⁷⁷⁹
- [ROARMAP](#)⁷⁸⁰ (Registry of Open Access Repositories Mandatory Archiving Policies). The most comprehensive list of university OA mandates. Also includes funding agency OA mandates.
- [Unanimous faculty votes for university OA policies](#).⁷⁸¹ A list maintained by the [Open Access Directory](#).⁷⁸²
- Relevant tag libraries from the [Open Access Tracking Project](#).⁷⁸³ These are archives of alerts to news and comment on certain OA subtopics. The library for each tag is updated in real time and includes links to live RSS and Atom feeds:
 - [Items tagged with "oa.best_practices"](#)⁷⁸⁴ (including best practices on all OA-related topics, not just university OA policies)
 - [Items tagged with "oa.case.policies.universities"](#)⁷⁸⁵ (case studies of university OA policies)
 - [Items tagged with "oa.case.repositories"](#)⁷⁸⁶ (case studies of OA repositories)
 - [Items tagged with "oa.deposits"](#)⁷⁸⁷ (on depositing work in institutional repositories)
 - [Items tagged with "oa.ir"](#)⁷⁸⁸ (for "institutional repositories")
 - [Items tagged with "oa.mandates"](#)⁷⁸⁹ (including funder mandates, not just university mandates)
 - [Items tagged with "oa.policies"](#)⁷⁹⁰ (including funder policies, not just university policies)

Endnotes

- ¹ <http://bit.ly/goodoa>
- ² <https://cyber.law.harvard.edu/node/95485>
- ³ <http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/openaccess/boai-10-recommendations>
- ⁴ <http://www.eecs.harvard.edu/shieber/>
- ⁵ http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/~psuber/wiki/Peter_Suber
- ⁶ <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7733-8195>
- ⁷ <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3577-2890>
- ⁸ shieber@seas.harvard.edu, psuber@cyber.law.harvard.edu
- ⁹ <http://www.arl.org/>
- ¹⁰ <http://aoasg.org.au/>
- ¹¹ <http://www.sparc.arl.org/COAPI>
- ¹² <https://www.coar-repositories.org/>
- ¹³ <http://www.eivfl.net/>
- ¹⁴ http://www.openscholarship.org/jcms/c_5012/en/home
- ¹⁵ http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Main_Page
- ¹⁶ <http://www.medoanet.eu/>
- ¹⁷ http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Main_Page
- ¹⁸ <http://www.pasteur4oa.eu/>
- ¹⁹ <http://www.openoasis.org/>
- ²⁰ <http://www.righttoresearch.org/>
- ²¹ <http://www.sparc.arl.org/>
- ²² <http://www.sparceurope.org/>
- ²³ <http://web.archive.org/web/20130815022905/http://open-access.org.uk>
- ²⁴ <http://sciencecommons.org/wp-content/uploads/Opening-the-Door.pdf>
- ²⁵ http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1890467
- ²⁶ <https://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2012/09/17/is-the-harvard-open-access-policy-legally-sound/>
- ²⁷ <http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/boai-10-recommendations>
- ²⁸ <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/PDFandIR.php?>
- ²⁹ https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/sample_waiver
- ³⁰ <http://library.duke.edu/research/openaccess>
- ³¹ <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/modelpolicy>
- ³² <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/modelpolicy>
- ³³ <http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>
- ³⁴ <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/modelpolicy>

- ³⁵ <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/>
- ³⁶ <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/dash/termsfuse>
- ³⁷ <http://www.oacomact.org/>
- ³⁸ http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Implementing_a_policy#Individualized_writing
- ³⁹ https://www.library.ucsf.edu/sites/all/files/ucsf_assets/ucsf_oa_faqs.pdf
- ⁴⁰ <http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/policy-faq/>
- ⁴¹ <http://scholcomm.columbia.edu/open-access/open-access-policies/frequently-asked-questions/>
- ⁴² <http://library.duke.edu/research/openaccess>
- ⁴³ <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/policies>
- ⁴⁴ <http://libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/mit-open-access/open-access-at-mit/mit-open-access-policy/mit-faculty-open-access-policy-faq/>
- ⁴⁵ <https://ed.stanford.edu/faculty-research/open-archive/open-access-qa>
- ⁴⁶ <http://codes.lp.findlaw.com/uscode/17/2/205>
- ⁴⁷ <http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/>
- ⁴⁸ <http://vpr.harvard.edu/harvard-university-participation-agreement>
- ⁴⁹ http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Author_addenda
- ⁵⁰ <http://www.webarchive.org.uk/wayback/archive/20140614064952/http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/pals3/pirus.aspx>
- ⁵¹ <http://www.cranfieldlibrary.cranfield.ac.uk/pirus2/tiki-index.php>
- ⁵² <http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2011/03/12/the-importance-of-dark-deposit/>
- ⁵³ <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/PDFandIR.php?>
- ⁵⁴ <http://web.archive.org/web/20100621104636/http://oaseminar.fecyt.es/Publico/AlhambraDeclaration/index.aspx>
- ⁵⁵ <http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/boai-10-recommendations>
- ⁵⁶ <http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/business-innovation-and-skills/news/on-publ-open-access/>
- ⁵⁷ <http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/business-innovation-and-skills/>
- ⁵⁸ http://medoanet.eu/sites/www.medoanet.eu/files/documents/MED2013_GUIDELine_dp_EN_ws.pdf
- ⁵⁹ <http://www.medoanet.eu/>
- ⁶⁰ <http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2005/04/choosing-oa-and-getting-tenure-too.html>
- ⁶¹ <http://www.seas.harvard.edu/>
- ⁶² <http://officeforscholarlycommunicationharvardlibrary.createsend.com/t/ViewEmailArchive/t/0B74E30D40EFCA3A/C67FD2F38AC4859C/>

- ⁶³ <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue35/harnad>
- ⁶⁴ http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/hefce/content/news/news/2013/open_access_letter.pdf
- ⁶⁵ <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/>
- ⁶⁶ <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2014/201407/>
- ⁶⁷ <http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories/technical-framework/search>
- ⁶⁸ <https://support.google.com/webmasters/answer/35769?hl=en>
- ⁶⁹ <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/model-pub-agreement-090430.pdf>
- ⁷⁰ <http://scholars.sciencecommons.org/>
- ⁷¹ <http://libraries.mit.edu/forms/dspace-oa-articles.html>
- ⁷² <http://libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/comments-on-open-access-articles/>
- ⁷³ <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/dash/stories>
- ⁷⁴ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Ah86t49DI4&list=PL2SOU6wwxB0suycszlp2ltzbWqmYk2pg&index=1>
- ⁷⁵ <http://www.arts.ac.uk/>
- ⁷⁶ <http://www.gold.ac.uk/>
- ⁷⁷ https://uni-of-nottingham.adobeconnect.com/_a908729032/p91snqnsbau/
- ⁷⁸ <http://www.strath.ac.uk/>
- ⁷⁹ <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/LR-01-2013-0002>
- ⁸⁰ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/>
- ⁸¹ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/grow/advocacy/issues/>
- ⁸² <https://www.coar-repositories.org/>
- ⁸³ https://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final1.pdf
- ⁸⁴ <http://www.uonbi.ac.ke/>
- ⁸⁵ https://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final1.pdf
- ⁸⁶ http://www.eifl.net/system/files/resources/201408/kenya-oa-case-study-final_2013.pdf
- ⁸⁷ <http://www.jkuat.ac.ke/>
- ⁸⁸ http://www.eifl.net/system/files/resources/201408/kenya-jkuat-oa-case-study-final_2013.pdf
- ⁸⁹ <http://www.sun.ac.za>
- ⁹⁰ <http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Audit>
- ⁹¹ <http://scholar.sun.ac.za/>
- ⁹² <http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar>
- ⁹³ http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Audit/Section_9
- ⁹⁴ <http://www.qut.edu.au/>
- ⁹⁵ <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/86146/>
- ⁹⁶ <http://www.columbia.edu/>
- ⁹⁷ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/implementing-strategies-to-encourage-deposit/>
- ⁹⁸ <http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/home.cfm>
- ⁹⁹ <http://nzresearch.org.nz/>
- ¹⁰⁰ <http://www.usq.edu.au/>
- ¹⁰¹ http://web.archive.org/web/20080720061653/http://rubric.edu.au/packages/RUBRIC_Toolkit/docs/Publicity_and_Marketing/USQ_ePrints_Marketing06.pdf
- ¹⁰² <https://www.uillinois.edu/>
- ¹⁰³ <http://www.umass.edu/>
- ¹⁰⁴ <http://umich.edu/>

- ¹⁰⁵ <http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/index.html>
- ¹⁰⁶ <https://www.osu.edu/>
- ¹⁰⁷ http://works.bepress.com/ir_research/30/
- ¹⁰⁸ <http://www.bc.edu/>
- ¹⁰⁹ <http://www.hku.hk/>
- ¹¹⁰ <http://www.sun.ac.za/>
- ¹¹¹ <https://www.helsinki.fi/en>
- ¹¹² <https://www.ncsu.edu/>
- ¹¹³ <http://umanitoba.ca/>
- ¹¹⁴ <http://home.byu.edu/home/>
- ¹¹⁵ <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1186468/?ln=hr>
- ¹¹⁶ <http://www.csic.es/web/guest/home>
- ¹¹⁷ http://proyectos.bibliotecas.csic.es/digitalcsic/semana_acceso_abierto/2012/index.html
- ¹¹⁸ <http://digital.csic.es/dc/revista-csic-abierto/>
- ¹¹⁹ http://digital.csic.es/bitstream/10261/52123/4/Digital_CSIC_2011_eng.pdf
- ¹²⁰ <http://web.archive.org/web/20110619013223/http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/research>
- ¹²¹ <http://web.archive.org/web/20120706153442/http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories>
- ¹²² <http://web.archive.org/web/20121001071244/http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories/management-framework/advocacy>
- ¹²³ <http://web.archive.org/web/20121001070843/http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories/management-framework/culture-change>
- ¹²⁴ <http://web.archive.org/web/20121001070834/http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories/management-framework/core-message>
- ¹²⁵ <http://web.archive.org/web/20121001071312/http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories/management-framework/options>
- ¹²⁶ <http://web.archive.org/web/20121001071243/http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories/management-framework/activities>
- ¹²⁷ <https://mx2.arl.org/lists/sparc-oaforum/Message/5399.html>
- ¹²⁸ <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/>
- ¹²⁹ <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/116819/1/116819.pdf>
- ¹³⁰ <https://www.qut.edu.au/>
- ¹³¹ <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/573/>
- ¹³² http://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final1.pdf
- ¹³³ <http://www.coar-repositories.org/>
- ¹³⁴ <http://drf.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/drf/>
- ¹³⁵ <http://drf.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/drf/index.php?plugin=attach&refer=Digital%20Repository%20Federation%20%28in%20English%29&openfile=hitahita2011.pdf>
- ¹³⁶ <http://www.uni-konstanz.de/willkommen/>
- ¹³⁷ http://web.archive.org/web/20120813013720/http://open-access.net/de/wissenswertes_fuer/betreiber_von_repositorien/einwerben_von_dokumenten
- ¹³⁸ <http://www.eifl.net/eifl-oa-case-studies>
- ¹³⁹ <http://www.uz.ac.zw/>
- ¹⁴⁰ <http://www.kcn.unima.mw/>
- ¹⁴¹ <http://www.lu.lv/eng/>

- ¹⁴² <http://www.uofk.edu/>
- ¹⁴³ <http://web.archive.org/web/20120322221131/http://www.eifl.net/news/eifl-open-access-advocacy-grants-deliver-big->
- ¹⁴⁴ <http://www.exeter.ac.uk/>
- ¹⁴⁵ <http://jisc-reposit.blogspot.com/2011/01/university-of-exeter-advocacy-plan.html>
- ¹⁴⁶ <http://www.uminho.pt/>
- ¹⁴⁷ <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january08/ferreira/01ferreira.html>
- ¹⁴⁸ <http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/projects/kultivate/index.html>
- ¹⁴⁹ <http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/toolkits/advocacy/index.html>
- ¹⁵⁰ <https://rspproject.wordpress.com/2011/07/15/two-new-toolkits-to-kultivate-artistic-research-deposit/>
- ¹⁵¹ <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/>
- ¹⁵² <http://repository.jisc.ac.uk/503/>
- ¹⁵³ <https://www.ethz.ch/en.html>
- ¹⁵⁴ <http://mit.edu/>
- ¹⁵⁵ <http://www.rochester.edu/>
- ¹⁵⁶ <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue49/gierveld/>
- ¹⁵⁷ <https://www.jyu.fi/en/>
- ¹⁵⁸ https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/37729/OA-Survey_Results.pdf?sequence=1&goback=.gde_3304213_member_111833028
- ¹⁵⁹ <http://crc.nottingham.ac.uk/>
- ¹⁶⁰ <http://web.archive.org/web/20100831194756/http://researchcommunications.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2010/02/04/peer-baseline-why-dont-authors-deposit/>
- ¹⁶¹ <http://www.cam.ac.uk/>
- ¹⁶² <http://www.uhi.ac.uk/en>
- ¹⁶³ <http://jisc-reposit.blogspot.com/2010/08/literature-review-ctrep-cambridge-tetra.html>
- ¹⁶⁴ <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/>
- ¹⁶⁵ <http://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/UKSGFiles/272/UKSGeNews272.pdf>
- ¹⁶⁶ <http://ubuea.cm/>
- ¹⁶⁷ <http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10539/8952/37%20Koelen%20Shafack,%20Ngum.pdf?sequence=1>
- ¹⁶⁸ <http://ktisis.cut.ac.cy/>
- ¹⁶⁹ <http://www.cut.ac.cy/?languaged=1>
- ¹⁷⁰ <http://ktisis.cut.ac.cy/handle/10488/4837>
- ¹⁷¹ <http://oregonstate.edu/>
- ¹⁷² <http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/handle/1957/11003>
- ¹⁷³ <http://www.dmu.ac.uk/home.aspx>
- ¹⁷⁴ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=DORA%20presentation%20Feb%202010%20270112%20pptx.pptx>
- ¹⁷⁵ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/>
- ¹⁷⁶ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/library/daedalus/index.html>
- ¹⁷⁷ <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue39/mackie>
- ¹⁷⁸ <http://www.rochester.edu/>
- ¹⁷⁹ <https://urresearch.rochester.edu/fileDownloadForInstitutionalItem.action?itemId=1787&itemFileId=2266>
- ¹⁸⁰ <http://illinois.edu/>

¹⁸¹ <http://www.umass.edu/>

¹⁸² <http://umich.edu/>

¹⁸³ <http://twin-cities.umn.edu/>

¹⁸⁴ <https://www.osu.edu/>

¹⁸⁵ <https://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/28419/118-449-1-PB.pdf>

¹⁸⁶ <http://www.rollins.edu/>

¹⁸⁷ <http://rollins-olin-library.blogspot.com/2010/06/creating-change-in-scholarly.html>

¹⁸⁸ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/>

¹⁸⁹ http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=Nixon_JISCRTE_Feb2012.ppt

¹⁹⁰ <http://www.kzoo.edu/>

¹⁹¹ <https://cache.kzoo.edu/handle/10920/3593>

¹⁹² http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1131&context=lib_research

¹⁹³ <http://www.northampton.ac.uk/>

¹⁹⁴ [http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=Bringing%20a%20buzz%20to%20NECTAR%20JISCRte%20event%20100212%20\(2\).pptx](http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=Bringing%20a%20buzz%20to%20NECTAR%20JISCRte%20event%20100212%20(2).pptx)

¹⁹⁵ <http://www.caltech.edu/>

¹⁹⁶ <http://www.istl.org/06-summer/viewpoints.html>

¹⁹⁷ <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/>

¹⁹⁸ <http://web.archive.org/web/20120604185915/http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68185>

¹⁹⁹ <http://www.uminho.pt/>

²⁰⁰ <http://web.archive.org/web/20120603200505/http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68188>

²⁰¹ <http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

²⁰² <https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/handle/10023/1824>

²⁰³ <http://www.calpoly.edu/>

²⁰⁴ <http://www.ala.org/alcts/resources/papers/irs#2>

²⁰⁵ <http://www.ipcb.pt/en/>

²⁰⁶ <http://liber.library.uu.nl/index.php/lq/article/view/8047/8436>

²⁰⁷ <http://www.gsu.edu/>

²⁰⁸ <http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/>

²⁰⁹ http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2012/09/opinion/backtalk/gsu-library-promotes-open-access-to-new-faculty-backtalk/#_

²¹⁰ <http://www.open.ac.uk/>

²¹¹ <http://oro.open.ac.uk/22321/>

²¹² <http://www.sun.ac.za/>

²¹³ <http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/images/0/0e/Marketing.pdf>

²¹⁴ http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/29804/1/Research_spectrum.pdf

²¹⁵ <http://www.lse.ac.uk/>

²¹⁶ <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/>

²¹⁷ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/>

²¹⁸ <http://web.archive.org/web/20110709040445/http://open-access.org.uk/>

²¹⁹ <http://web.archive.org/web/20110509072122/http://open-access.org.uk/information-and-guidance>

²²⁰ <http://web.archive.org/web/20120202045554/http://open-access.org.uk/information-and-guidance/advocacy>

²²¹ <http://web.archive.org/web/20131211135036/http://open-access.org.uk/information-and-guidance/advocacy-key-resources/>

222 http://www.ulg.ac.be/cms/c_5000/home

223 <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/>

224 <https://www.qut.edu.au/>

225 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1ulf6awDzCo>

226 <https://enlightenrepository.wordpress.com/2011/05/13/open-access-repositories-resource-pack-oarrpack/>

227 <http://cadair.aber.ac.uk/dspace/handle/2160/2499>

228 <http://welshrepositorynetwork.blogspot.com/2010/06/advocacy-discussion-barriers-and.html>

229 <http://library.web.cern.ch/>

230 <http://webzine.web.cern.ch/webzine/12/papers/2/>

231 <http://www.furman.edu>

232 <http://jisc-pub.org/jisc/vol2/iss1/2/>

233 <http://miamioh.edu/>

234 <http://jisc-pub.org/jisc/vol2/iss3/8/>

235 <http://bibapp.org/>

236 <http://bibapp.org/2010/07/01/bibapp-10-released/>

237 <https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/>

238 <http://research.mblwhoilibary.org/>

239 <https://experts.kumc.edu/>

240 <http://www.mh-hannover.de/index.php?&L=1>

241 <http://blogs.plos.org/mfenner/2010/10/26/self-motivated-vs-mandated-archiving/>

242 <http://www.openoar.org/>

243 http://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/v011/11.2.hanlon.html

244 <http://www.eprints.org/depositmo/>

245 <http://blog.soton.ac.uk/depositmo/>

246 <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140702233839/http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/inf11/jiscdepo/depositmo.aspx>

247 <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue68/gramstadt>

248 <http://blog.soton.ac.uk/depositmo/>

249 <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/rd/projects/digital-repositories>

250 <http://scholarship20.blogspot.com/2012/11/deposit-strand.html>

251 <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/inf11/jiscdepo/dura.aspx#>

252 <http://www.symplectic.co.uk/news-events/2012/05/16/dura-project-with-mendeley-and-caret/>

253 <http://symplectic.co.uk/products/elements/>

254 <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/inf11/jiscdepo/dura.aspx>

255 <http://easydeposit.swordapp.org/>

256 <http://swordapp.org/>

257 <http://blog.stuartlewis.com/2010/05/29/deposit-to-multiple-repositories/>

258 <https://github.com/stuartlewis/EasyDeposit/wiki>

259 <http://www.library.auckland.ac.nz/>

260 <http://blog.stuartlewis.com/2010/02/03/easydeposit-sword-deposit-tool-creator/>

261 <http://www.openarchives.org/OAI/openarchivesprotocol.html>

262 <http://www.openarchives.org/OAI/openarchivesprotocol.html>

263 <http://edina.ac.uk/projects/oa-rj/index.html>

²⁶⁴ <http://opendepot.org/>
²⁶⁵ http://edina.ac.uk/projects/ORI_summary.html
²⁶⁶ <http://ori.edina.ac.uk/index.html>
²⁶⁷ <http://puma.uni-kassel.de/>
²⁶⁸ <http://www.bibsonomy.org/>
²⁶⁹ <http://blog.bibsonomy.org/2009/08/puma-project-on-academic-publication.html>
²⁷⁰ <http://jiscreposit.blogspot.com/2010/07/introducing-reposit.html>
²⁷¹ <http://jiscreposit.blogspot.com/>
²⁷² <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/>
²⁷³ <http://www.keele.ac.uk/>
²⁷⁴ <http://www.qmul.ac.uk/>
²⁷⁵ <http://www.exeter.ac.uk/>
²⁷⁶ <https://www.plymouth.ac.uk/>
²⁷⁷ <http://symplectic.co.uk/>
²⁷⁸ <http://jiscreposit.blogspot.com/2010/08/literature-review-ctrep-cambridge-tetra.html>
²⁷⁹ http://edina.ac.uk/projects/RJB_summary.html
²⁸⁰ http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=RJ_Broker_RSP_event_12_June_mm_2013.pptx
²⁸¹ <http://www.nature.com/>
²⁸² <http://europepmc.org/>
²⁸³ http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=RJ_Broker_RSP_event_12_June_mm_2013.pptx
²⁸⁴ <http://swordapp.org/>
²⁸⁵ <http://www.biomedcentral.com/>
²⁸⁶ <http://mit.edu/>
²⁸⁷ <http://www.biomedcentral.com/presscenter/pressreleases/20100429>
²⁸⁸ <https://www.coar-repositories.org/>
²⁸⁹ <http://www.peerproject.eu/>
²⁹⁰ http://www.peerproject.eu/fileadmin/media/reports/D3_1_Guidelines_v8.3_20090528.Final.pdf
²⁹¹ <http://www.coar-repositories.org/activities/repository-content/sustainable-practices-for-populating-repositories-report/>
²⁹² <http://mit.edu/>
²⁹³ <http://uksg.metapress.com/content/l437x1631052407r/>
²⁹⁴ <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january12/lewis/01lewis.html>
²⁹⁵ <http://arxiv.org/>
²⁹⁶ <http://dataconservancy.org/>
²⁹⁷ <https://conferences.tdl.org/or2011/index.php/OR2011/OR2011main/paper/viewFile/403/97>
²⁹⁸ <https://www.auckland.ac.nz/en.html>
²⁹⁹ <http://www.ox.ac.uk/>
³⁰⁰ <http://www.dataflow.ox.ac.uk/>
³⁰¹ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/engage-with-sword-to-allow-deposit-transactions/>
³⁰² <https://www.coar-repositories.org/>
³⁰³ https://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final1.pdf
³⁰⁴ <https://www.coar-repositories.org/>
³⁰⁵ <https://www.griffith.edu.au/>
³⁰⁶ https://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-practices-preliminary-results_final.pdf

³⁰⁷ <http://www.uminho.pt/>

³⁰⁸ <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january08/ferreira/01ferreira.html>

³⁰⁹ <http://www.cut.ac.cy/?languageld=1>

³¹⁰ <http://www.slideshare.net/LibraryCUT/scholar-publications-and-open-access-policies-the-ktisis-case>

³¹¹ <http://www.vads.ac.uk/>

³¹² <http://web.archive.org/web/20120302193327/http://www.research.ucreative.ac.uk/copyright.html>

³¹³ <http://www.riadne.ac.uk/issue68/gramstadt>

³¹⁴ <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/>

³¹⁵ <http://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/UKSGFiles/272/UKSGeNews272.pdf>

³¹⁶ <http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/>

³¹⁷ <http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/>

³¹⁸ <http://lshtmresearchonline.blogspot.com/2012/05/how-and-why-lshtm-research-online-works.html?m=1>

³¹⁹ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/>

³²⁰ <http://www.riadne.ac.uk/issue39/mackie>

³²¹ http://archive.ifla.org/IV/ifla72/papers/155-Mark_Shearer-en.pdf

³²² <http://illinois.edu/>

³²³ <http://www.umass.edu/>

³²⁴ <http://umich.edu/>

³²⁵ <http://twin-cities.umn.edu/>

³²⁶ <https://www.osu.edu/>

³²⁷ <https://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/28419/118-449-1-PB.pdf>

³²⁸ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/>

³²⁹ http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=Nixon_JISCRTE_Feb2012.ppt

³³⁰ <http://oregonstate.edu/>

³³¹ http://connect.ala.org/files/25884/andrea_wirth_oapolicynotes062710_pdf_18762.pdf

³³² <http://mit.edu/>

³³³ <http://libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/comments-on-open-access-articles/>

³³⁴ <http://www.seas.harvard.edu/directory/plu>

³³⁵ <http://www.harvard.edu/>

³³⁶ <http://www.boisestate.edu/>

³³⁷ https://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final2.pdf

³³⁸ <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13614533.2012.717901#.VdElZypViko>

³³⁹ <http://www.sun.ac.za>

³⁴⁰ <http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Audit>

³⁴¹ <http://scholar.sun.ac.za/>

³⁴² http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Community_Management

³⁴³ http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Asset_Submissions

³⁴⁴ <http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Indexes>

³⁴⁵ http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Audit/Section_7

³⁴⁶ <https://www.qut.edu.au/>

³⁴⁷ <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/86146/>

³⁴⁸ <http://www.mh-hannover.de/index.php?&L=1>

³⁴⁹ <https://www.escidoc.org/>

³⁵⁰ <http://blogs.plos.org/mfenner/2010/10/26/self-motivated-vs-mandated-archiving/>

351 <http://www.uminho.pt/>

352 <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january08/ferreira/01ferreira.html>

353 http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1131&context=lib_research

354 <http://www.csic.es/web/guest/home>

355 http://www.researchinformation.info/features/feature.php?feature_id=183

356 http://digital.csic.es/bitstream/10261/52123/4/Digital_CSIC_2011_eng.pdf

357 http://www.ulg.ac.be/cms/c_5000/home

358 http://www.richardpoynder.co.uk/Rentier_Interview.pdf

359 <http://www.uminho.pt/>

360 <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/>

361 <http://public.web.cern.ch/public/>

362 <http://web.archive.org/web/20120606005105/http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68182>

363 <http://dare.uva.nl/cgi/arno/show.cgi?fid=93898>

364 <http://www.cornell.edu/>

365 <http://vivo.cornell.edu/>

366 <http://www.ox.ac.uk/>

367 <http://brii-oxford.blogspot.com/>

368 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13614533.2010.509996#.VdHa7ypViko>

369 <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/>

370 <http://www.stir.ac.uk/>

370 <http://www.uminho.pt/>

372 <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/268511/1/saledraftv5.pdf>

373 <http://www.open.ac.uk/>

374 <http://oro.open.ac.uk/22321/>

375 <http://www.cmu.edu/>

376 <https://journals.tdl.org/jodi/index.php/jodi/article/view/2068>

377 <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/about/faculty-staff-directory/todd-rogers>

378 <http://www.strath.ac.uk/>

379 <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/LR-01-2013-0002>

380 <http://ir.uiowa.edu/about.html>

381 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0361526X.2013.800632#.VdI-5CpViko>

382 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IA-6d-FP-b4&list=PLA5071430DFE028CE&index=4&feature=plpp_video

383 <http://www.gsu.edu/>

384 http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0361526X.2013.800632#.VdI_LipViko

385 <https://www.qut.edu.au/>

386 <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/86146/>

387 <http://www.columbia.edu/>

388 <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/implementing-strategies-to-encourage-deposit/>

389 <http://www.gsa.ac.uk/search?search=radar>

390 <http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/>

391 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=JISC_Radar.pptx

392 <http://www.ucreative.ac.uk/>

393 <http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/toolkits/decision-making/index.html>

394 <https://rspproject.wordpress.com/2011/07/15/two-new-toolkits-to-kultivate-artistic-research-deposit/>

³⁹⁵ <http://www.rca.ac.uk/>
³⁹⁶ <http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/casestudies/RCA2011.pdf>
³⁹⁷ <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue68/gramstadt>
³⁹⁸ <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/>
³⁹⁹ <http://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/UKSGFiles/272/UKSGeNews272.pdf>
⁴⁰⁰ <http://www.csic.es/web/guest/home>
⁴⁰¹ http://www.researchinformation.info/features/feature.php?feature_id=183
⁴⁰² <http://www.tdl.org/>
⁴⁰³ <http://sourceforge.net/projects/vireo/>
⁴⁰⁴ <http://www.imls.gov/>
⁴⁰⁵ <http://www.tdl.org/2010/09/tdl-releases-vireo-etc-system-opensource-software/>
⁴⁰⁶ <http://symplectic.co.uk/products/elements/>
⁴⁰⁷ <http://www.cdlib.org/>
⁴⁰⁸ <http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/policy-text/>
⁴⁰⁹ <http://www.cdlib.org/cdinfo/2014/03/03/the-university-of-california-awards-contract-to-symplectic-for-the-implementation-of-a-publication-harvesting-system-to-support-ucs-open-access-policy/>
⁴¹⁰ <http://www.psu.edu/>
⁴¹¹ <https://www.gmu.edu/>
⁴¹² <https://www.zotero.org/>
⁴¹³ <https://scholarsphere.psu.edu/>
⁴¹⁴ <http://news.psu.edu/story/312098/2014/04/15/academics/penn-state-awarded-mellon-grant-study-personal-scholarly-archiving>
⁴¹⁵ <https://www.ethz.ch/en.html>
⁴¹⁶ <https://www.library.ethz.ch/en/About-us/News-archiv/News-2010/ETH-E-Citations-ETH-Zurich-university-bibliography>
⁴¹⁷ <http://e-collection.library.ethz.ch/>
⁴¹⁸ <http://www.library.ethz.ch/en/ms/Open-Access-at-ETH-Zurich/News/Uploading-publications-onto-E-Collection-directly-from-E-Citations>
⁴¹⁹ <http://www.vt.edu/>
⁴²⁰ <https://www.coar-repositories.org/news-media/sparc-open-access-meeting-notes/>
⁴²¹ <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/>
⁴²² <http://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/UKSGFiles/272/UKSGeNews272.pdf>
⁴²³ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/>
⁴²⁴ <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue39/mackie>
⁴²⁵ <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/rd/projects/digital-repositories>
⁴²⁶ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/embedding-and-integrating-repositories/#programme>
⁴²⁷ <http://www.dmu.ac.uk/>
⁴²⁸ <http://www2.hull.ac.uk/>
⁴²⁹ <http://www.gsa.ac.uk/>
⁴³⁰ <http://www.mdx.ac.uk/>
⁴³¹ <http://www.northampton.ac.uk/>
⁴³² <http://www.vads.ac.uk/>
⁴³³ <http://www.ucreative.ac.uk/>

⁴³⁴ <http://www.arts.ac.uk/>

⁴³⁵ <http://rspproject.wordpress.com/2012/02/14/how-embedded-and-integrated-is-your-repository/>

⁴³⁶ <http://atira.dk/en/pure/>

⁴³⁷ <http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

⁴³⁸ <http://www.abdn.ac.uk/>

⁴³⁹ <http://www.york.ac.uk/>

⁴⁴⁰ <http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/rim/projects/cris-oar/uk-overview.pdf>

⁴⁴¹ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/embeddingguide/introduction-to-the-guide-2/case-study-aberdeen/>

⁴⁴² <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/embeddingguide/introduction-to-the-guide-2/case-study-nectar/>

⁴⁴³ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/embeddingguide/introduction-to-the-guide-2/case-study-dundee/>

⁴⁴⁴ <https://rspproject.wordpress.com/2011/12/13/rsp-embedding-guide/>

⁴⁴⁵ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/embeddingguide/self-assessment-tool/>

⁴⁴⁶ <http://portal.uc3m.es/portal/page/portal/home>

⁴⁴⁷ <http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2009/04/universidad-carlos-iii-de-madrid-adopts.html>

⁴⁴⁸ <http://webcast.in2p3.fr/videos-rodriques>

⁴⁴⁹ <http://www.uminho.pt/>

⁴⁵⁰ <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january08/ferreira/01ferreira.html>

⁴⁵¹ <http://web.archive.org/web/20120603200505/http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68188>

⁴⁵² <http://www.hioa.no/>

⁴⁵³ <http://web.archive.org/web/20101218023449/http://hio.no/Aktuelt/HiO-nytt/Arkiverte-nyheter/2010/02/Last-inn-i-ODA>

⁴⁵⁴ <http://www.uminho.pt/>

⁴⁵⁵ <http://webcast.in2p3.fr/videos-rodriques>

⁴⁵⁶ http://www.uzh.ch/about_en.html

⁴⁵⁷ <http://dx.doi.org/10.1087/20110409>

⁴⁵⁸ <http://archive.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/eng/ibp/irc.html>

⁴⁵⁹ <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10694-010-0198-1>

⁴⁶⁰ <http://www.ulg.ac.be>

⁴⁶¹ http://www.richardpoynder.co.uk/Rentier_Interview.pdf

⁴⁶² <http://listserver.sigmaxi.org/sc/wa.exe?A2=ind09&L=american-scientist-open-access-forum&D=1&O=D&F=I&S=&P=866>

⁴⁶³ <http://www.ed.ac.uk/>

⁴⁶⁴ <http://www.google.com/analytics/>

⁴⁶⁵ <http://wiki.eprints.org/w/IRStats>

⁴⁶⁶ <http://www.bath.ac.uk/>

⁴⁶⁷ <http://www.bath.ac.uk/ris/pure/>

⁴⁶⁸ https://uni-of-nottingham.adobeconnect.com/_a908729032_p4l822cibld/?launcher=false&fcsContent=true&pbMode=normal

⁴⁶⁹ <http://www.hud.ac.uk/>

⁴⁷⁰ <http://www.irus.mimas.ac.uk/>

⁴⁷⁰ <http://wiki.eprints.org/w/IRStats>

⁴⁷² <http://uksg.metapress.com/content/pv4136g54718h125/fulltext.pdf>

⁴⁷³ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/institutional-repository-usage-statistics-irus-uk/#programme>

⁴⁷⁴ <http://cottageclabs.com/>

⁴⁷⁵ <http://us.okfn.org/>
⁴⁷⁶ <https://github.com/okfn/facetview>
⁴⁷⁷ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/impact-metrics-for-repositories/>
⁴⁷⁸ <http://plumanalytics.com/>
⁴⁷⁹ <http://plumanalytics.com/more-ways-to-tell-the-stories-of-research/>
⁴⁸⁰ <http://plumanalytics.com/utah-state-university-using-plumx-to-help-their-researchers/>
⁴⁸¹ <http://web.archive.org/web/20120923024842/http://www.plumanalytics.com/university-of-pittsburgh-becomes-first-institution-to-adopt-plum-analytics-to-provide-metrics-for-research-output.html>
⁴⁸² <http://www.pitt.edu/>
⁴⁸³ <http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/19115/>
⁴⁸⁴ <http://plumanalytics.com/plumx-and-institutional-repositories/>
⁴⁸⁵ <http://www.unl.edu/>
⁴⁸⁶ <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01930826.2011.589340#.VdNxSfVhBc>
⁴⁸⁷ <https://www.coar-repositories.org/>
⁴⁸⁸ <https://www.plos.org/>
⁴⁸⁹ <http://api.plos.org/alm/faq/>
⁴⁹⁰ https://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final2.pdf
⁴⁹¹ <http://english.cas.cn/>
⁴⁹² https://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final2.pdf
⁴⁹³ <http://www.bris.ac.uk/>
⁴⁹⁴ <http://researchrevealed.ilrt.bris.ac.uk/>
⁴⁹⁵ <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/>
⁴⁹⁶ <http://researchrevealed.ilrt.bris.ac.uk/files/2012/02/rr-evaluation-report-final.pdf>
⁴⁹⁷ <http://umich.edu/>
⁴⁹⁸ <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/landing.jsp>
⁴⁹⁹ <https://researchremix.wordpress.com/2013/01/10/first-draft-of-nature-comment/>
⁵⁰⁰ <https://www.qut.edu.au/>
⁵⁰¹ <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/86146/>
⁵⁰² <http://www.columbia.edu/>
⁵⁰³ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/implementing-strategies-to-encourage-deposit/>
⁵⁰⁴ <http://www.kyushu-u.ac.jp/english/>
⁵⁰⁵ <http://hdl.handle.net/2324/18911>
⁵⁰⁶ <http://www.rochester.edu/>
⁵⁰⁷ <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13614533.2010.509517>
⁵⁰⁸ <http://www.qut.edu.au/>
⁵⁰⁹ <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/573/>
⁵¹⁰ <http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/>
⁵¹¹ <http://univstandrews-oaresearch.blogspot.com/2012/02/new-public-stats-now-available-for.html>
⁵¹² http://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final2.pdf
⁵¹³ <http://www.murdoch.edu.au/>
⁵¹⁴ <http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/>
⁵¹⁵ <http://creativecommons.org.au/learn/glam/openarchives/>
⁵¹⁶ <http://www.uminho.pt/>

517 <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january08/ferreira/01ferreira.html>

518 <http://web.archive.org/web/20120603200505/http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68188>

519 <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/>

520 <http://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/UKSGFiles/272/UKSGeNews272.pdf>

521 <http://www.dmu.ac.uk/>

522 <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=DORA%20presentation%20Feb%2010%20270112%20pptx.pptx>

523 <http://escholarship.org/>

524 http://archive.ifla.org/IV/ifla72/papers/155-Mark_Shearer-en.pdf

525 <http://www.csic.es/web/guest/home>

526 <http://digital.csic.es/>

527 http://www.researchinformation.info/features/feature.php?feature_id=183

528 <http://www.elprofesionaldelainformacion.com/contenidos/2010/septiembre/15.html>

529 <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/>

530 <http://web.archive.org/web/20120604185915/http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68185>

531 <http://www.utas.edu.au/>

532 <http://www.harzing.com/pop.htm>

533 <https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/5427.html>

534 <https://www.butler.edu/>

535 <http://www.uow.edu.au/index.html>

536 <http://digitalcommons.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=newsletter>

537 <http://www.manchester.ac.uk/>

538 <http://manchesterescholar.blogspot.com/2012/06/institutional-repositories-and.html>

539 <http://www.boisestate.edu/>

540 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13614533.2012.717901#.VdSTKfVhBc>

541 <https://www.coar-repositories.org/>

542 <http://www.hku.hk/>

543 <http://wiki.eprints.org/w/MePrints>

544 <http://vivoweb.org/>

545 https://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final1.pdf

546 <http://www.columbia.edu/>

547 <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/implementing-strategies-to-encourage-deposit/>

548 <https://www.uillinois.edu/>

549 <http://www.umass.edu/>

550 <http://umich.edu/>

551 <http://twin-cities.umn.edu/>

552 <https://www.osu.edu/>

553 http://works.bepress.com/ir_research/30/

554 <http://orcid.org/>

555 <http://www.mh-hannover.de/index.php?&L=1>

556 <http://blogs.plos.org/mfenner/2010/10/26/self-motivated-vs-mandated-archiving/>

557 <http://www.rca.ac.uk/>

558 <http://wiki.eprints.org/w/MePrints>

559 <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue68/gramstadt>

560 http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/20110804_eNova.pdf

561 <http://www.cau.edu.cn/>

562 <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july11/chenying/07chenying.print.html>

563 <http://www.narcis.nl/>

564 <http://www.rochester.edu/>

565 http://archive.ifla.org/IV/ifla72/papers/155-Mark_Shearer-en.pdf

566 <http://illinois.edu/>

567 <http://www.umass.edu/>

568 <http://umich.edu/>

569 <http://twin-cities.umn.edu/>

570 <https://www.osu.edu/>

571 <https://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/28419/118-449-1-PB.pdf>

572 <http://www.gla.ac.uk/>

573 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=Nixon_JISCRTE_Feb2012.ppt

574 <http://www.unl.edu/>

575 <http://digitalcommons.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=newsletter>

576 <http://www.utas.edu.au/>

577 <http://eprints.utas.edu.au/410/>

578 <https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/5427.html>

579 <http://www.rochester.edu/>

580 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13614533.2010.509517#.VdSZZvVhBc>

581 <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january05/foster/01foster.html>

582 <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/03/02/repositories>

583 <http://www.arts.ac.uk/>

584 <http://uni-of-nottingham.adobeconnect.com/p91snqnsbau/>

585 <https://www.coar-repositories.org/>

586 <http://www.vt.edu/>

587 <http://www.ub.edu/web/ub/en/>

588 <http://english.cas.cn/>

589 https://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final1.pdf

590 <http://www.hku.hk/>

591 <http://cilea.github.io/dspace-cris/>

592 https://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final1.pdf

593 <http://www.boisestate.edu/>

594 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2012.717901>

595 <http://www.unimi.it/>

596 https://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final1.pdf

597 <http://www.unl.edu/>

598 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01930826.2011.589340>

599 <https://www.coar-repositories.org/>

600 <http://www.concordia.ca/>

601 <http://www.sun.ac.za/>

602 <http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Audit>

603 <http://scholar.sun.ac.za/>

⁶⁰⁴ http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Guidelines/Step_10

⁶⁰⁵ <http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Populating>

⁶⁰⁶ http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Audit/Section_6

⁶⁰⁷ <http://web.archive.org/web/20120123173751/http://rubric.edu.au/>

⁶⁰⁸ http://web.archive.org/web/20120206064156/http://rubric.edu.au/RUBRIC_Toolkit/index.htm

⁶⁰⁹ <http://www.columbia.edu/>

⁶¹⁰ <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/implementing-strategies-to-encourage-deposit/>

⁶¹¹ <http://www.wooster.edu/>

⁶¹² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O9iTYO9VKfo>

⁶¹³ <http://pastebin.com/sXknBHDq>

⁶¹⁴ <https://www.uillinois.edu/>

⁶¹⁵ <http://www.umass.edu/>

⁶¹⁶ <http://umich.edu/>

⁶¹⁷ <http://twin-cities.umn.edu/>

⁶¹⁸ <https://www.osu.edu/>

⁶¹⁹ http://works.bepress.com/ir_research/30/

⁶²⁰ <http://www.csic.es/web/guest/home>

⁶²¹ http://digital.csic.es/bitstream/10261/52123/4/Digital_CSIC_2011_eng.pdf

⁶²² <http://www.anu.edu.au/>

⁶²³ <https://www.coar-repositories.org/activities/repository-content/sustainable-practices-for-populating-repositories-report/>

⁶²⁴ http://cairss.caul.edu.au/www/open_access/danny_kingsley/recruiting_material_for_repositories.pdf

⁶²⁵ <http://web.mit.edu/>

⁶²⁶ <http://www.sparc.arl.org/news/sparc-2012-open-access-program-and-speaker-slides>

⁶²⁷ <http://web.mit.edu/>

⁶²⁸ <http://www.biomedcentral.com/>

⁶²⁹ <http://serials.uksg.org/articles/abstract/10.1629/23212/>

⁶³⁰ <http://newsoffice.mit.edu/2010/open-access-policy>

⁶³¹ <http://uit.no/inenglish>

⁶³² <http://nile.lub.lu.se/ojs/index.php/sciecominfo/article/view/5422/4748>

⁶³³ <http://www.harvard.edu/>

⁶³⁴ <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/dash/fellows>

⁶³⁵ <http://openbiomed.info/2011/06/oa-fellows-harvard/>

⁶³⁶ <http://archive.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/eng/ibp/irc.html>

⁶³⁷ <http://www.springerlink.com/content/7700u176n83558k7/>

⁶³⁸ <http://www.cut.ac.cy/>

⁶³⁹ <http://ktisis.cut.ac.cy/>

⁶⁴⁰ <http://ktisis.cut.ac.cy/handle/10488/4837>

⁶⁴¹ <http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/>

⁶⁴² <http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/>

⁶⁴³ <http://lshtmresearchonline.blogspot.com/2012/05/how-and-why-lshtm-research-online-works.html?m=1>

⁶⁴⁴ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/>

⁶⁴⁵ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/library/daedalus/index.html>

646 <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue39/mackie>

647 <http://www.ed.ac.uk/>

648 http://archive.ifla.org/IV/ifla72/papers/155-Mark_Shearer-en.pdf

649 http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1131&context=lib_research

650 <http://www.caltech.edu/>

651 <http://www.istl.org/06-summer/viewpoints.html>

652 <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/>

653 <http://web.archive.org/web/20120604185915/http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68185>

654 <http://home.web.cern.ch/>

655 <http://web.archive.org/web/20120605193425/http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68180>

656 <http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

657 <https://rspproject.wordpress.com/2011/01/10/guest-post-by-jackie-proven-increasing-repository-content-at-st-andrews-using-merit-data/>

658 <http://law.wm.edu/>

659 <http://www.wm.edu/news/stories/2012/law-scholarship-repository-scores-millionth-download.php>

660 <http://www.tdl.org/>

661 <http://sourceforge.net/projects/vireo/>

662 <http://www.tdl.org/2010/09/tdl-releases-vireo-etc-system-opensource-software/>

663 <https://etd.tamu.edu/>

664 https://wikis.tdl.org/tdl/Vireo/Texas_Tech_beta

665 <https://utexas-etc.tdl.org/>

666 <http://www.cmu.edu/index.shtml>

667 <https://journals.tdl.org/jodi/index.php/jodi/article/view/2068>

668 <http://www.bca.bw/>

669 <http://journals.sfu.ca/iaald/index.php/aginfo/article/view/127>

670 <http://www.unimelb.edu.au/>

671 <http://www.uq.edu.au/>

672 <https://www.qut.edu.au/>

673 <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/>

674 <http://www.strath.ac.uk/>

675 <http://www.gla.ac.uk/>

676 <http://www.lunduniversity.lu.se/>

677 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2007.09.020>

678 <http://library.web.cern.ch/>

679 <http://library.web.cern.ch/library/Webzine/12/papers/2/>

680 http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Unanimous_faculty_votes

681 <http://bit.ly/oa-book>

682 http://archive.org/stream/9780262517638OpenAccess/9780262517638_Open_Access#page/n97/mode/2up

683 <http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/boai-10-recommendations>

684 <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:4727443>

685 <http://www.seas.harvard.edu/~shieber/>

686 <http://bit.ly/suber-gplus>

687 shieber@seas.harvard.edu, psuber@cyber.law.harvard.edu

688 <http://bit.ly/goodoa>

⁶⁸⁹ <http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/bestpracticesguide-2013.pdf>

⁶⁹⁰ <http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Goodpracticesguide-2015.pdf>

⁶⁹¹ apage@cyber.law.harvard.edu

⁶⁹² <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/modelpolicy>

⁶⁹³ http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Main_Page#Policy_consultations

⁶⁹⁴ <http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hfaspolicy>

⁶⁹⁵ <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hlspolicy>

⁶⁹⁶ <https://ed.stanford.edu/faculty-research/open-archive/open-access-motion>

⁶⁹⁷ <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hksgpolicy>

⁶⁹⁸ <http://libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/mit-open-access/open-access-at-mit/mit-open-access-policy/>

⁶⁹⁹ <http://policy.ku.edu/governance/open-access-policy>

⁷⁰⁰ <http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/policysignup/fullinfo.php?inst=University%20of%20Oregon%3A%20Library%20Faculty>

⁷⁰¹ <https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/4950.html>

⁷⁰² <http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hgsepolicy>

⁷⁰³ <http://www.trinity.edu/org/senate/Trinity%20University%20Open%20Access%20Policy.pdf>

⁷⁰⁴ <http://www.oberlin.edu/library/programs/openaccess/resolution.html>

⁷⁰⁵ http://zsr.wfu.edu/documents/ZSR_Librarians_Assembly_Open_Access_Policy.pdf

⁷⁰⁶ <http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hbspolicy>

⁷⁰⁷ http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_facpub/Open_Access_Policy_Final_02252010.pdf

⁷⁰⁸ <http://library.duke.edu/openaccess/duke-openaccess-policy.html>

⁷⁰⁹ <https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/5436.html>

⁷¹⁰ <http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hdspolicy>

⁷¹¹ <http://library.manoa.hawaii.edu/about/scholcom/oaatuhm.html>

⁷¹² <http://scholcomm.columbia.edu/open-access/open-access-policies/lamont-doherty-earth-observatory-open-access-policy/>

⁷¹³ <http://www.eifl.net/news/strathmore-university-open-access-policy-keny>

⁷¹⁴ <http://guides.main.library.emory.edu/content.php?pid=43389&sid=2144393>

⁷¹⁵ <http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hgsdpolicy>

⁷¹⁶ <http://scholcomm.columbia.edu/open-access/open-access-policies/columbia-university-libraries-information-services-open-access-policy/>

⁷¹⁷ <http://www.princeton.edu/dof/policies/publ/fac/open-access-policy/>

⁷¹⁸ <http://www.hope.edu/admin/provost/fachandbook/Obligations/C6-C9/C9.html>

⁷¹⁹ <http://nile.lub.lu.se/ojs/index.php/sciecominfo/article/view/5425/4751>

⁷²⁰ <http://www.bifrost.is/islenska/um-haskolann/stefna-og-hlutverk/opinn-adgangur/>

⁷²¹ http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CClQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.jkuat.ac.ke%2F%3Fwvpmact%3Dprocess%26did%3DNjguaG90bGlUaw%3D%3D&ei=5nV4UNjMAY-M0QH4o4H4DQ&usq=AFQjCNGkNk5ceu_i5MW0zdbKxLorZVH-A&sig2=SPrJ8r5ZZ_wCa2HynZ5mNA

⁷²² <http://www.usu.edu/hr/files/uploads/535.pdf>

⁷²³ http://www.lib.muohio.edu/news_and_notes/open-access-policy

⁷²⁴ <http://www.library.ucsf.edu/help/scholpub/oapolicy>

⁷²⁵ http://library.umassmed.edu/oa_policy

⁷²⁶ <http://publications.mcgill.ca/reporter/2012/10/mcgill-librarians-announce-support-of-open-access-movement/>

⁷²⁷ <http://soar.libraries.rutgers.edu/>

⁷²⁸ <http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hspolicy>

⁷²⁹ http://library.gatech.edu/scdc/OA_policy_draft

⁷³⁰ http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm~doc/olinopenaccesspolicy_approved_112812.pdf

⁷³¹ <http://www.eifl.net/news/university-nairobi-open-access-policy>

⁷³² <http://new.wellesley.edu/sites/default/files/assets/departments/provost/files/openaccesspolicy2.13.13.pdf>

⁷³³ <http://openaccess.voices.wooster.edu/policy/>

⁷³⁴ <https://www.amherst.edu/library/about/policies/openaccess>

⁷³⁵ http://www.uri.edu/facsen/about/legislation/legislation_documents/2012-13/Bill_12-13-29.pdf

⁷³⁶ <http://sites.allegheeny.edu/scholarlycommunication/acoapolicy/>

⁷³⁷ <https://openarchive.stanford.edu/content/gse-student-open-archive-motion>

⁷³⁸ http://library.caltech.edu/coda/OA_Policy_6.10.2013.pdf

⁷³⁹ <http://cdss.library.oregonstate.edu/open-access>

⁷⁴⁰ <http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/>

⁷⁴¹ <http://repository.brynmawr.edu/oapolicy.pdf>

⁷⁴² http://www.davidketcheson.info/2014/07/01/KAUST_goes_open_access.html

⁷⁴³ http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/committees/library_affairs/Draft-IUPUI-Open-Access-Policy-package-copyedited-20140828.pdf

⁷⁴⁴ <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hmspolicy>

⁷⁴⁵ <http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/node/9401>

⁷⁴⁶ <http://www.harvard.edu/>

⁷⁴⁷ <http://shorensteincenter.org/research-publications/open-access-policy/>

⁷⁴⁸ <http://www.harvard.edu/>

⁷⁴⁹ <http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Research/SCHOLARLYARTICLES.html>

⁷⁵⁰ <http://www.bu.edu/library/files/2015/02/Open-Access-Policy-2015.pdf>

⁷⁵¹ <http://guides.lib.udel.edu/scholcom/openaccess>

⁷⁵² <http://faccoun.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/Res2015-09OnOpenAccess.pdf>

⁷⁵³ <http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/boai-10-recommendations>

⁷⁵⁴ <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/59212/>

⁷⁵⁵ <http://www.coar-repositories.org/news-media/sustainable-practices-for-populating-repositories-report-published/>

⁷⁵⁶ http://www.ala.org/alcts/sites/ala.org.alcts/files/content/resources/papers/ir_ch05_.pdf

⁷⁵⁷ http://www.openscholarship.org/jcms/c_6217/formulating-an-institutional-open-access-policy

⁷⁵⁸ http://www.eua.be/Libraries/Publications_homepage_list/Open_access_report_v3.sflb.ashx

⁷⁵⁹ <http://openaccess.eprints.org/index.php?archives/864-.html>

⁷⁶⁰ <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/267298/>

⁷⁶¹ <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/modelpolicy>

⁷⁶² <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/guides/your-institution-and-open-access>

⁷⁶³ http://medoanet.eu/sites/www.medoanet.eu/files/documents/MED2013_GUIDELINE_dp_EN_ws.pdf

⁷⁶⁴ <http://www.medoanet.eu/news/medoanet-guidelines-implementing-open-access-policies-available-7-languages>

⁷⁶⁵ http://www.openoasis.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=145&Itemid=298

⁷⁶⁶ <http://projeto.rcaap.pt/index.php/lang-pt/consultar-recursos-de-apoio/remository?func=fileinfo&id=336>

- ⁷⁶⁷ <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/268511/>
- ⁷⁶⁸ <http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/category/scholarly-communication/>
- ⁷⁶⁹ http://www.sparc.arl.org/bm~doc/sparc_boycott_next_steps.pdf
- ⁷⁷⁰ <http://www.sparc.arl.org/issues/open-access/get-involved>
- ⁷⁷⁰ <http://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/4322589>
- ⁷⁷² <http://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/4317659>
- ⁷⁷³ [http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Practical_guidelines_for_starting_an_institutional_repository_\(IR\)](http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Practical_guidelines_for_starting_an_institutional_repository_(IR))
- ⁷⁷⁴ <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002158/215863e.pdf>
- ⁷⁷⁵ <http://web.archive.org/web/20150529131345/http://open-access.org.uk/information-and-guidance/>
- ⁷⁷⁶ <http://aoasg.org.au/>
- ⁷⁷⁷ <http://aoasg.org.au/open-access-policies/>
- ⁷⁷⁸ <http://www.sparc.arl.org/COAPI>
- ⁷⁷⁸ <http://www.sparc.arl.org/COAPI/contacts>
- ⁷⁸⁰ <http://roarmap.eprints.org/>
- ⁷⁸¹ http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Unanimous_faculty_votes
- ⁷⁸² http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Main_Page
- ⁷⁸³ http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Open_Access_Tracking_Project
- ⁷⁸⁴ http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/oatp/tag/oa.best_practices
- ⁷⁸⁵ <http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/oatp/tag/oa.case.policies.universities>
- ⁷⁸⁶ <http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/oatp/tag/oa.case.repositories>
- ⁷⁸⁷ <http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/oatp/tag/oa.deposits>
- ⁷⁸⁸ <http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/oatp/tag/oa.ir>
- ⁷⁸⁹ <http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/oatp/tag/oa.mandates>
- ⁷⁹⁰ <http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/oatp/tag/oa.policies>



Berkman

The Berkman Center for Internet & Society
at Harvard University